

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,110, Vol. 43.

February 3, 1877.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE COMING SESSION.

ANY confident forecast of the events of a Parliamentary Session may be usefully corrected by reference to the retrospective reflections which are almost always suggested at its close. It is usually difficult at the end of six months to recall the special hopes and fears which attended the meeting of Parliament. Circumstances have almost always changed in the interval; and the tendency of excitement to wear itself out is sometimes proportioned to its temporary vehemence. There may be exceptions to the general rule when the attention of Parliament has been chiefly occupied with some great legislative measure, such as the abolition of the Irish Church Establishment, or the reduction of the Parliamentary franchise. In ordinary times the most animated contests turn upon issues which have beforehand seemed to possess only secondary importance. It is highly probable that the question which has occupied exclusive attention during the recess may furnish comparatively little matter for Parliamentary discussion. The agitators, indeed, may perhaps have inflicted serious damage on the Government; but, as their influence operates almost exclusively on the multitude, they must wait for a general election to obtain the reward of their strenuous efforts. They have undoubtedly produced a popular impression; but the irritation of their leader against "frequenters of Clubs" and "members of "good society" involves the admission that the more intelligent classes almost universally disapprove of rhetorical and bellicose philanthropy. The majority of the House of Commons will reflect the public opinion of those sections of the community to which its members principally belong. Mr. GLADSTONE might, even if he had not announced his intention at the Taunton railway station, have been trusted to make a violent, and probably eloquent, attack on the Ministers. The leader of his party may perhaps feel himself obliged to concur with his volatile predecessor in some motion of censure; but, after a single debate and a division in which the Ministerial victory is assured beforehand, it will not be easy to revive a profitless discussion. Even if Mr. GLADSTONE eventually makes up his mind to propose war with Turkey, so wanton a policy would not be supported by fifty members of the House of Commons. It is not likely that the situation of affairs will be materially altered in the few days before the beginning of the Session. The Russian Government wisely suspends the announcement of resolutions which have perhaps not yet been definitively formed. If Serbia is allowed to conclude peace with Turkey, the risk of invasion will appear less imminent; but it is not to be expected that the present uncertainty will be speedily removed. So great a potentate as the Emperor of Russia ought not to allow a momentous decision to depend either on language which he may have hastily used or on possibly mistaken criticisms of the organization and discipline of his army.

After all deductions from the practical importance of the impending discussions, the debates in both Houses will be expected with reasonable curiosity. Lord SALISBURY will probably smile at the portentous solemnity with which his forthcoming revelations are anticipated. He will have an opportunity before Thursday next of conferring with his colleagues, and the statements which will be addressed by the Ministers to Parliament will be the result of deliberate concert. Eager newsmongers will undoubtedly endeavour to discern some difference of tone or of language among the representatives of the Government; but it may be hoped that Lord

BEACONSFIELD has profited by voluminous comments on his imprudent speeches; and Lord DERBY's explanations might be confidently reported beforehand by any attentive student of political transactions. Lord SALISBURY will not think it necessary to confide to the House of Lords his private opinion of the characters of General IGNATIEFF and MIDHAT PASHA. If he should be at liberty, through the consent both of his colleagues and of the Ministers of the different Courts, to give some account of his official interviews with Continental statesmen, some light may perhaps be thrown both on the proceedings of the Conference and on its final issue. It is at least certain that Lord SALISBURY will be loyal to the Cabinet which reposed confidence in his ability and judgment, and that he will not be grateful for compliments which may be invidiously paid to the Plenipotentiary at the expense of the PRIME MINISTER and the FOREIGN SECRETARY. Among the leaders of the Opposition in the House of Lords, the Duke of ARGYLL alone has hitherto committed himself to the policy of Mr. GLADSTONE. Lord GRANVILLE, Lord KIMBERLEY, Lord CARDWELL, and Lord SELBORNE will perhaps content themselves with the retrospective criticism to which the conduct of the Government is undoubtedly liable. None of them can fail to remember, what Mr. GLADSTONE obstinately forgets, that the policy of Lord BEACONSFIELD and Lord DERBY in the early part of the controversy was the same which the Liberal Government had systematically pursued. The Foreign Minister of 1871 will scarcely contend that the treaty which he agreed to remodel in that year had been long before annulled by the neglect of the Turkish Government to keep its promises of amendment. Lord KIMBERLEY, once English Minister at St. Petersburg, may perhaps himself be secretly guilty of that distrust of Russia which Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE earnestly disclaims.

The debate in the House of Commons will be equally interesting, though the principal Ministerial explanations may probably be delivered in the Upper House. With the exception of the Duke of ARGYLL and of Lord BATH, few peers are likely to reproduce the spirit of the Bulgarian agitation. On this, as on other occasions, the House of Lords represents the judgment of cultivated society, which neither cherishes a sentimental enthusiasm for the Turks nor acknowledges the responsibility of England for their proceedings. The House of Commons affords a more favourable field for popular eloquence; and Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE will but ineffectually pour oil on the troubled waters which will be stirred up by Mr. GLADSTONE. His burning indignation will probably be echoed in subdued tones by Lord HARTINGTON, Mr. FORSTER, and other members of the former Government; and Mr. LOWE's personal and political antipathies are as warm and as genuine as Mr. GLADSTONE'S. Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT has perhaps taken the point off his attacks on the Government by out-of-door speeches and letters to the papers; but, although the Ministers may confidently expect a majority, they will in the House of Commons be overmatched in debate. Mr. HARDY has for some time past confined himself to the business of his department. Mr. CROSS is rather an excellent administrator than a statesman or an orator. The Ministerial leader possesses and deserves the confidence of the House of Commons; but he will not single-handed conduct with advantage an unequal contest. On some points he has already weakened his position by unnecessarily accepting the doctrines or professions of his adversaries. If it is wrong to suspect Russia of doing at present what Russia has always done in the past, Lord BEACONSFIELD cannot

be wholly exonerated from the charge of undue suspicion. In a party struggle it is not always prudent even to deprecate unfounded imputations or barbarous nicknames. It may not be pleasant to be called a Turcophile or a Russophobic; but a protest against the charge is construed as an admission that suspicion of Russia or fairness to Turkey would be blamable. It is possible to maintain a conventional confidence in a foreign Government without an ostentatious repudiation of latent suspicion. Prince ALBERT laid down the true rule when he praised Lord ABERDEEN for assuming in correspondence the good faith of the Russian Government, but not for conforming either his belief or his conduct to a courteous fiction.

No former Session has opened in the midst of equally general indifference to the prospects of legislation. The laudable desire of the Government to keep official secrets has on this occasion been seconded by the diversion of public attention to foreign affairs. It is rather to be wished than to be hoped that Lord BEACONSFIELD may not have prepared some surprise in the form of some Bill which may be designed for the purpose of superseding the existing agitation. His colleagues would probably be more adverse than himself to startling measures; nor is it easy to remember any urgent demand which could be gratified by proposals of change. Mr. CROSS will probably be prepared with some modest and useful Bills, and the Government may perhaps at last grapple with the difficult question of the pollution of rivers. Notwithstanding Lord BEACONSFIELD's predilections, there is no danger of an attempt to extend household suffrage to counties; there will be no need for an Education Bill; the Judicature Act is not ripe for amendment; the licensed victuallers will, as far as the Government is concerned, be left in peace. Nevertheless the promises of the QUEEN'S Speech will be large enough to need an apology in August for incomplete performance. Any failure in carrying Government measures will not have the excuse that they have made way for elaborate financial debates. It is already known that the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER will have to content himself with an unambitious Budget; and it will be well if he can dispense with some increase of taxation. If the Turkish business is once safely disposed of, there is no reason to expect any Ministerial crisis or difficult political complication. The Government has every motive for keeping the present Parliament together, for only gross mismanagement could shake its hold on the present House of Commons. It is extremely probable that the next election may reverse the verdict of 1874; but the Opposition is for the present in a hopeless minority. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE is not likely to commit any mistake so considerable as to destroy the advantages which his Government enjoys.

MR. GLADSTONE AT TAUNTON.

MR. GLADSTONE'S speech at Taunton was perhaps the most violent and least instructive which he has delivered during four months of passionate and unscrupulous agitation. He may, however, the more easily repudiate imprudent language which may be attributed to the possible errors of reporters, inasmuch as he does not hesitate to misquote the words of his own celebrated pamphlet. The *Saturday Review* of January 13 referred, not for the first time, to Mr. GLADSTONE's proposal "that the Turks, or at least all Turkish officials, should be driven out of Europe." The original passage applied to the whole Turkish population, which was at the same time denounced as "the great anti-human specimen of humanity." It is impossible to believe that a cultivated and practised writer would have spoken of the Turks if he had intended only to censure their public functionaries; but a few days afterwards, having apparently become aware of the extravagance of his own suggestion, Mr. GLADSTONE persuaded himself, and explained in a letter to the *Times*, that he only wished to expel the Bimbashis and a string of other official persons, whose titles he enumerated. His new version, which was virtually a retraction, was for reasons of courtesy accepted by the *Saturday Review*, without a suspicion that Mr. GLADSTONE was prepared once more to deny his use of words which must, at least on the second occasion, have been deliberately employed. In a letter printed in the *Daily News* Mr. GLADSTONE audaciously accuses the *Saturday Review* of "perverse misrepresenta-

tion" in quoting with careful accuracy his own amended proposal. "The reference," Mr. GLADSTONE says, "may be to the latter part of my pamphlet, in which I state that 'the official Turks should carry off themselves, as an Opposition might say of a Ministry in this country.'" If Mr. GLADSTONE meant no more than that certain official changes should be effected, he might have expressed his meaning in intelligible language. It is impossible even to affect a conventional belief in the statement that he merely proposed a transfer of offices such as that which was effected when Mr. GLADSTONE's Government made way for Mr. DISRAELI's in 1874. Not content with denouncing the entire Turkish nation, Mr. GLADSTONE also attacked the Mahometan religion. The phrases which he now substitutes for his fierce invective might have been unobjectionable, but they would not have earned for him the popular applause which he has since incessantly courted. His first explanation was obviously an afterthought; his present attempt to fritter away the sense of words of which he seems to have become ashamed is a miserable quibble. That there has been perverse misrepresentation is certain; but the *Saturday Review* is wholly innocent in the matter. With so elastic a use of rhetoric, Mr. GLADSTONE will probably be prepared on occasion to explain away his assertion at Taunton that the Turks have neither the virtue nor the capacity to reform. The contrary statement is, as he facetiously observes, "a monstrous exaggeration, a sentimental statement, a rhetorical artifice." Three months hence Mr. GLADSTONE may, if it suits his purpose, declare that a literal quotation of his wild phrases is a perverse misrepresentation.

Some of the propositions of Mr. GLADSTONE's speech are calculated to mislead public opinion more seriously than inflated expressions of national and religious animosity. He has more than once asserted that the object and effect of the Crimean war was to deprive Russia of a protectorate over the Christian subjects of Turkey which had been acquired by foreign treaties. The quarrel of the Emperor NICHOLAS with the Porte was founded, not on alleged violations of existing engagements, but on the refusal of the SULTAN to concede new rights of interference. The Vienna Note was provisionally approved by a section of the English Cabinet, which probably included Mr. GLADSTONE; but Sir STRATFORD CANNING's sagacity and honesty detected the real purpose of the document, which involved the virtual concession of the Russian demands. On his advice the Porte rejected the Note; and the decision was immediately afterwards justified by a despatch in which Count NESSELRODE adopted the exact interpretation which had been suggested by Sir STRATFORD CANNING. The Treaty of Paris could not have transferred to the Great Powers a protectorate which, by the admission of all parties, had no existence before the war. Interference by the European Governments with the domestic affairs of Turkey was expressly excluded from the provisions of the treaty, though it may of course be excused or justified by general considerations of policy or humanity. It was after detection of the true intent of the Vienna Note that Prince ALBERT, who had been strongly opposed to war on behalf of Turkey, became convinced that the perfidy of Russia left no alternative but resistance. Mr. GLADSTONE's imperfect recollection of transactions in which he took, or ought to have taken, an active part may perhaps be partially explained by his habitual neglect of foreign affairs. The true history of the Crimean war is not as generally known as the existence of the kingdom of Prussia, as to which Mr. GLADSTONE expressed a doubt; but a political leader of great official experience ought not to be acquitted of inaccuracy on the ground of ignorance.

Mr. GLADSTONE's doctrine of the obligation and avoidance of treaties exhibits dangerous moral laxity and total disregard of the spirit of international law. He repeated at Taunton the assertion which he has made on several occasions, that the treaties of 1856 are no longer binding, because the Turks have, as he contends, violated obligations which may have been implied, though they were certainly not expressed, in the text of the treaty. If Mr. GLADSTONE's theory were adopted, it would be useless to conclude treaties; for either party might at any time release himself from his undertaking by alleging misconduct on the other side. In public or private relations, the remedy for a breach of contract is not another breach, but the exaction of damages or other satisfaction which may be appropriate to the case. It is a monstrous proposition that an agreement binding on six or seven Governments can be

wholly abolished by the act of any one of the number. In the present instance Turkey is not even alleged to have broken any covenant on which any or all of the Powers could have insisted by virtue of the treaty. Whatever excuses may be devised for disregard of ethical rules in dealing with Mahometans, the Prime Minister of 1871 is estopped from alleging that the Treaty of Paris has been repealed by the misconduct of the Turks. In that year Mr. GLADSTONE, unless he grossly neglected his official duty, took a principal part in re-enacting the provisions which have now, according to his contention, ceased to be operative. At that time the Porte either had, or had not, discharged its obligations under the treaty. If it had then introduced the stipulated reforms, it would be absurd to argue that subsequent negligence could have disintituled the Turkish Government to the benefit of its performance of the treaty. Mr. GLADSTONE would adopt the opposite alternative of accusing the Porte of systematic neglect of its duties from 1856 to the present time; but on that assumption he condoned in 1871 fifteen years of misconduct, which, as he thereby virtually acknowledged, in no way impaired the validity of the treaty. The true explanation of his inconsistency is that in 1871, as in 1876 or 1877, he has been guided by considerations either of convenience or of party passion. As Prime Minister he was disposed to hush up troublesome questions; as an enemy of the present Government he gives the reins to fanatical violence. He is so thoroughly blinded by impetuosity as to imagine that a tripartite treaty to which Turkey was not a party has been invalidated by the Bulgarian massacre. It may not suit the purpose of Austria, France, or England, to demand the performance of conditions with which no other Power is concerned; but it would be a strange answer to a demand for giving effect to the treaty that there had been misgovernment in a Turkish province.

Mr. GLADSTONE shares with other recent speakers the serious error of requiring the Government to adopt some active policy, while he shrinks from the responsibility of proposing the definite course to which his arguments seem to point. English Liberals and Russian journalists allege, in nearly the same language, the inconsistency of allowing the Turks to reject with impunity proposals to which the English Government was a party; but neither Mr. GLADSTONE nor Sir W. HARCOURT distinctly recommends an attempt to coerce the Porte by the despatch of a naval force to the Dardanelles. Sir W. HARCOURT perhaps was content to leave Russia to deal with a population of two millions; but he has by this time probably remembered the ten or twelve millions of Asiatic Turks whose existence he had for the moment overlooked. A few zealous and logical politicians who openly propose the use of force against Turkey may be acquitted of the inconsistency which must for the present be attributed to the great body of the assailants of the Government. It was from the first evident that the Conference might end in failure unless the European Powers were prepared to enforce the acceptance of their demands. If Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE's words have any meaning, the Government is fully determined to decline any active interference. The great mass of the community, including perhaps Mr. GLADSTONE himself, would unhesitatingly regret any proposal of hostile acts against Turkey. It is unworthy of a statesman to taunt a Government with its adhesion to a policy in which he really himself concurs. If, on the other hand, Mr. GLADSTONE and his political allies deliberately pledge themselves to measures of coercion, they will place an intelligible and definite issue before the country; but it is difficult to believe that the least reticent of orators in the height of rhetorical excitement should have studiously concealed the only purpose which could have explained or excused the violence of his language.

A CRISIS ON THE STOCK EXCHANGE.

THE internal crisis which has just occurred in the Stock Exchange tends very strongly to confirm the impression which was produced by the disclosures of the Foreign Loans Committee as to the unsatisfactory condition of that body, and the urgent necessity which exists for a revision of its present constitution. It appears that on Monday last there was a "large and stormy" meeting of the members, at which two resolutions were passed; first, "That it is expedient that some arrangement be made to obviate the present secrecy of the proceedings

"of the Committee for General Purposes"; and, secondly, "That it is desirable that a careful examination be made, with professional assistance, of the Rules of the House, to ascertain whether they are in any way at variance with the laws of the land, and that, in case any variance be found, the rules should be amended so as to reconcile them with the law." The immediate origin of this agitation appears to have been a breach of the rules of the Exchange which it was thought that the General Committee had treated too lightly. According to the particulars given in the *Times*, a dealer, whose partner was a member of the Committee, had bought some Bank of Roumania shares from a broker at a price considerably under the market value, and then transferred them at the market value a few minutes afterwards. The matter was brought before the Committee, who came to the conclusion that the dealers in question, "in travelling out of their market and undertaking a transaction in shares which had not previously been within the range of their usual dealings, and in making a bid below such market-price as they might have found to exist if they had made proper inquiries, had departed from the customary and legitimate practice"; and directed that the amount in excess of the "turn" which the dealers were justly entitled to should be refunded. Some members of the Committee were of opinion that a verbal rebuke was not enough, and that a more serious punishment ought to be inflicted under the rules of the Stock Exchange; but the majority was in favour of lenient treatment. Thereupon Mr. INGALL, a member of the Committee, resigned, in order to mark his disapproval of this mode of dealing with the question, which he regarded as vital to the credit of the Stock Exchange; but he was invited to stand again, with the result that he was elected by 984 votes against 196 votes for another candidate. This was interpreted by the other members of the Committee as a vote of want of confidence in themselves, and they resigned in a body. The resolutions passed at the subsequent meeting of members of the Stock Exchange would seem to show that a considerable section of them are dissatisfied with the way in which the Committee have hitherto been acting, and wish for a change not only in the disposition of the Committee, but in the rules under which they exercise authority. On this point the public will cordially welcome any scheme of reform which may tend to place this important body in a more respectable, as well as more useful, position than it has for some time past occupied; but, whatever may be the result of the present movement, there can be little doubt that Parliament will feel bound to take up the question.

Under these circumstances, it is desirable that the actual constitution and methods of working of the Stock Exchange should be clearly understood. In his evidence before the Foreign Loans Committee, Mr. DE ZOETE, the then Chairman, described the way in which the organization has "gradually grown from a private body—that is to say, a domestic tribunal for the regulation merely of internal business—into a sort of public and quasi-judicial body." Its chief function now, as he also explained, is to promote the buying and selling of shares, and to see that bargains are settled. When asked whether the business of the Exchange was not "a sort of bet on what the price of certain shares would be on an appointed day," he indignantly replied, "No, it is an actual transaction; we know nothing of bets or prices; all we go in for is the fulfilment of bargains; you buy a stock, and on the day when the settlement takes place you must take it or provide for it." The burden of this witness's evidence was to the same effect, that all that the Stock Exchange has to do is to see that bargains are settled, and that it is not responsible for the kind of bargains which are made, even when they take the form of the wildest gambling. At the same time the Committee go through certain forms which it may be supposed, are intended to keep up the pleasant delusion that they are in some way protecting the outside public against frauds. For instance, before a settlement is granted, certain papers must be handed in; but when we inquire what precautions are taken to test the genuineness and honesty of these documents, we find that practically there are none. In the case of Companies it is now required by the Committee's rules that all statements shall be made under a statutory declaration, so that, if they are false in any respect, criminal penalties may be inflicted; but no such check is applied to loans, and in neither case do the Committee make any inquiry on their

own account. The Committee simply accepts them blindly on the faith that they are all right. Some idea of the way in which the Stock Exchange plays into the hands of dubious speculators may be gathered from the following passages of Mr. DE ZOETE's examination:—"Do you require any proofs as to the *bona fides* of the allotment?" "I cannot say we do; we take the assurance of the contractors; we do not ask for proof.—For instance, if they stated that the whole sum due upon allotment had been paid in to any joint-stock bank, should you inquire at the bank whether that was correct or not? There is no provision in the rules for that, and practically we do not make any inquiry." He admitted that before allotment took place loans were frequently dealt in on the Stock Exchange, and that brokers bought and sold for the contractors, "so as to make markets"; and also that sometimes members of the Committee were themselves dealers in foreign loans. "We are all members of the Stock Exchange, and all members are dealers in some shape or other." Again, he was asked whether sales before allotment are practically quoted on the Stock Exchange before the settling-day was fixed, and his reply was:—"Not officially quoted, but business can be done. Practically, prices can be made." The attitude of the Stock Exchange towards contractors and agents appears to be of the most confiding kind, as the following admissions show:—"Have you looked out for fraud? No, we have not looked for it.—In the whole of the foreign loans that have come before you, have you ever suspected fraud? I do not remember any case of the sort.—You have told us that you never look behind the certificate that a certain amount has been subscribed? No, we have taken that upon the responsibility and the character of the agents.—Even when in an application for a settlement a certain amount of stock was described as disposed of, as distinguished from subscribed, you did not think it necessary to make inquiry? No. So far as experience goes, we have found that the contractors, generally speaking, stood in a very high and honourable position, and we have been content to suppose that they have not been guilty of any misrepresentation, nor have we found any." Thus sits Justice at the Stock Exchange, not only blindfold, but with her ears stopped. Perhaps, however, Mr. DE ZOETE may have had his eyes opened a little on this point by the Parliamentary inquiry. As to letting an investor know the precise truth as to how much of an allotment has really been paid up, instead of allowing him to be deluded by the statement of the nominal amount, Mr. DE ZOETE said, "I do not see why he is damnified by that, because he merely knows what other people do. It is the price in the market—is it not?" Here, however, Mr. DE ZOETE overlooked the fact that the price is often "rigged," both by hollow transactions between brokers with "pocket orders" and by unfair private dealings before the shares become regularly saleable. Thus we find that the great object of the Stock Exchange is simply to bring as much business as it can into its own hands, and that the contractors and agents are closely mixed up with the brokers, and can make it worth while for the latter to be friends with them; and the effect of these influences may be traced in an anecdote which the late Chairman relates:—"There was at one time a strong feeling among brokers in respect of dealings before allotment in Companies, because they saw the market was sometimes made; we passed a rule that the Committee would not recognize bargains made before allotment; we had a strong representation from the members of the House in favour of it. The practical result of that was, that within a very few months it was all broken down, and the very persons, the brokers especially, who felt that there was business going on that the public would not know, got orders, and they said, 'We really cannot help it,' and came and requested us to abrogate that very law which they had helped to carry out." It will be seen that the above evidence fully justifies the summing up of the Foreign Loans Committee in regard to the Stock Exchange. In accounting for the scandalous state of things which had been exposed, the Committee observe that "something may be attributed to the proceedings of the Stock Exchange, which gives, by granting a quotation, a certain prestige to a loan which neither the very slight and superficial investigation on which the grant of a quotation is founded nor the nature of the tribunal seems to warrant." It is also pointed out that a tribunal such as the General

Committee of the Stock Exchange, which is elected by the members, and is bound to do what the electors deem for their own interest, is not fit for the exercise of judicial powers; and that it is unwise to allow such a body a discretionary power as to suppressing "questionable" proposals by which it alone, of all the public, is certain "to benefit."

After such a revelation of the actual working of the Stock Exchange and the hollowness of its pretensions to protect the public, it is not surprising that the more honourable and conscientious members should share the feelings of the public on the subject, and desire to see an amendment. It is evident that the powers which this body assumes to exercise are used for purely selfish objects, and tend to offer facilities for, rather than to check, fraudulent transactions. It has also been brought out in a recent law-suit, in which a decision has been given by the Court of Appeal against the Stock Exchange, that it pretends to a right to enforce its own rules, made to suit its own interest and convenience, in defiance of the general law of the land. When a member is a defaulter the General Committee seize upon his effects, without regard to other creditors, and take the adjudication of the matter into their own hands, instead of leaving it, as by law prescribed, to the Court of Bankruptcy. It is said, indeed, that the claims of non-members are admitted to this private Court, but it is not the less an arbitrary and illegal one. We have only to imagine what would happen if other trades were to adopt a similar system of combination, and insist, not only upon their own claims having priority to those of all other people, but on settling matters according to their own fancy. Altogether, it will be seen that a very strong case is made out for some reorganization of the existing Stock Exchange system.

THE AMERICAN PRESIDENCY.

THE Senate and House of Representatives of the United States have furnished a remarkable proof of the sound political instinct which above all other attributes qualifies a community for freedom. The people of the United States sometimes appear to take the same pleasure in trying alarming constitutional experiments which an athlete finds in a dangerous leap or in the ascent of a perpendicular cliff. The disputed Presidential election tempted partisans on either side to use violent language; and yet it was from the first certain that there would be no resort to force. It was only difficult for foreigners, although they might entertain well-founded confidence in the national good sense, to imagine the mode by which an escape from the actual dead-lock would be eventually secured. At the last moment a few of the leading Republicans intimated their disposition to prefer the tranquillity of the country to the pretended interests of their own party. The majority of the Committees nominated by both Houses agreed to recommend the appointment of a tribunal which has since been sanctioned by Congress, and approved by the President. Five Senators, five Representatives, and five members of the Supreme Court are to arbitrate on the alleged irregularities in the conduct and in the official return of the Southern elections. It is anticipated that the result will be the rejection of such a number of votes that neither candidate will be found entitled to the vacant seat. In that event the election of President will devolve on the House, which will choose Mr. TILDEN, and the Senate will elect Mr. WHEELER Vice-President. If, on the other hand, the votes of the three disputed States should, by the decision of the tribunal, be counted for Mr. HAYES, his title to the Presidency will not be disputed by the Democrats. It is far more important that there should be an appointment in which the whole community will acquiesce than that either of two competent candidates should be preferred to his rival. It would be inconvenient that a President should during his term of office be confronted with a kind of Pretender. The power of the President has been largely diminished by the control over patronage which was first assumed by the Senate during its contest with Mr. ANDREW JOHNSON, and which has since been jealously retained. General GRANT's failure to resist the pretensions of the Republican managers will probably disincite his successor to renew the contest. Although there are signs of an approaching change in the balance of parties in the Senate, there will be a Republican majority during the

whole or the greater part of the next Presidential term. Mr. TILDEN, if he is elected, will be held in check by the MORTONS, the BLAINES, and the CAMERONS; nor will they be disposed to allow a much larger range of discretion to Mr. HAYES. Mr. TILDEN's experience and ability may perhaps enable him to exercise some influence over policy and legislation; but questions relating to the tariff or to the resumption of specie payments must be determined by Congress. The most important duty of the incoming President will be the appointment of the Cabinet; and even in the selection of his confidential advisers he will be subject to the control of the Senate. General GRANT has been injudicious or unfortunate in the choice of several of the Ministers by whom he has been served. It is not to be supposed that either Mr. HAYES or Mr. TILDEN will appoint a Secretary of the Treasury such as Mr. BOUTWELL or Mr. RICHARDSON; or a Secretary of War of the character of General BELKNAP. It is not known how far either candidate is hampered by personal engagements incurred during the election.

It is possible rather than probable that the personal and political opinions of the PRESIDENT may seriously affect the interests of contending parties in the Southern States. During the late election the managers of both parties, after testing the indifference of their followers to less exciting topics, endeavoured, with questionable success, to raise the issue of the policy to be adopted in the South. General GRANT had on more than one occasion used the Executive authority for the purpose of deciding State contests in favour of the Republican party. Even his political allies in Congress repudiated the consequences of Federal interference in Louisiana; and the PRESIDENT himself prudently shrank from adopting General SHERIDAN's plan of establishing in some of the States a military despotism of the South American type. During the present struggle in Louisiana and in South Carolina General GRANT has improved in prudence and moderation. The Federal troops are ordered only to interfere for the suppression of disturbance; and there is no reason to apprehend a collision with the forces of the State. A civilian of either party will be less likely than General GRANT to use the army for political purposes; and there is reason to hope that in a short time the conflict between the white and coloured inhabitants may end in the undisputed supremacy of the higher race. The Northern adventurers who ruled and pillaged the South by the aid of coloured majorities have been driven from power in nearly every State; and it is evident that, as soon as the Federal troops are withdrawn, the Democrats will become supreme in Louisiana. It is unfortunate that two races which are separated by natural and irremovable distinctions should in any country be placed side by side. In a backward state of civilization order and legal equality may be secured under an impartial despotism. Representative institutions are not applicable to a mixed population, as long as party divisions correspond with differences of blood. White men and negroes, ranged as in South Carolina in hostile ranks, provide the materials of civil war. The established predominance of the superior race will be the best security against the use of violence and the practice of oppression. The Republicans of the North are beginning to learn their inability either to give direct protection to the negroes, or to enable them by the aid of the franchise to protect themselves. Universal suffrage confers not only facilities for self-defence, but the power of governing others. South Carolina negroes ought, like the rest of mankind, to be exempt from oppression; but their interference in government and legislation is an intolerable outrage on common sense and natural justice. As there is no third alternative, the State will only attain a position of stable equilibrium when the intelligent part of the community resumes the exercise of political power, with or without the use of some fiction which may reconcile the conditions of order with constitutional technicalities. There is reason to believe that in the States where the whites have resumed their natural superiority there is no disposition to oppress the labouring population. When the coloured voters despair of governing a State as a separate class, they may probably learn to distribute their votes between political parties. The Republicans throughout the Union would ultimately profit by the abolition of the geographical separation of parties. For many years before the civil war the whole of the South was necessarily allied to the Democrats, who on their part undertook to maintain and extend the range of the system of slavery. After the suppression of the Confederacy, the

victorious party cherished the vain hope of perpetuating its own supremacy by the aid of its negro clients in the reconstructed Southern States. As might have been expected, after a few years a natural reaction has displaced the temporary domination of the emancipated negroes, and the true American citizens of the South have, except in two or three States, resumed their former Democratic connexion for necessary purposes of self-defence. It is a singular anomaly that those who own the property and who form the natural aristocracy of a third part of the Union should be driven into the ranks of the same party which is supported by the indigenous and imported rabble of the great Atlantic cities. There is, in truth, little difference between the political doctrines of the two great parties; but tradition and hereditary custom would have made the Republicans the champions of property and order if Southern politics had not caused their adversaries to assume the title and, for some purposes, the functions of a Conservative party. If the conflict of races in the South were terminated by a discontinuance of the scandal of negro Governors and Legislatures, there is no reason why all respectable citizens in the Southern States should be members of the Democratic party.

The same good sense and practical ingenuity which have provided for a settlement of the Presidential dispute will afterwards find ample room for exercise in the adjustment of the remarkable conflicts of authority which are proceeding, or which are partially suspended, in Louisiana and South Carolina. In both States there are two Governors and two legislative bodies which affect to exercise all the powers that belong to constituted authorities. It is impossible for a stranger, and perhaps for an impartial American, to determine whether WADE HAMPTON or CHAMBERLAIN, whether NICHOLLS or PACKARD, has the better legal claim to the posts which they respectively profess to occupy; but no local knowledge is required for the conclusion that, either now or at some early period, the party which commands both moral and physical superiority will obtain permanent possession of the government. At New Orleans the Democratic forces are in undisputed possession of the town and of all the public offices, with the exception of the State House, which is occupied by the Republican Legislature under the protection of the Federal troops. It is a trifling but significant indication of the tendency of public opinion that the United States troops, though they would obey any orders which they might receive, take all suitable opportunities of expressing their good will to the Democrats. An additional omen of victory is the adhesion to the winning cause of the notorious KELLOGG, and probably of the not less celebrated CASEY, who is brother-in-law of the PRESIDENT. It is not impossible, indeed, that both patriots may have been bought over; but there can be no doubt that they would have charged a higher price for their conversion when the prospects of the Republicans were brighter. It may be doubted whether either the President or Congress has, under express provisions of the Constitution, power to determine contested State elections; but indirectly the President may for various purposes recognize a Governor, and the Senate has absolute jurisdiction to admit or reject a Senator who may be nominated by one or other of the rival Legislatures. As there is fortunately no disposition in any part of the South to oppose the central Government by force, even an informal decision may probably be accepted. The Democrats may perhaps be the less unwilling to give way because they may confidently rely on the attainment of their object at the next election.

THE BLOCK IN THE LAW COURTS.

THE difficulty of getting causes heard and decided, about which so many complaints have lately been made, is of somewhat longer standing than is supposed by those who attribute it to the circumstance that the Folkestone appeal is being heard before an unusually strong Court. If it is a sin to take up the time of ten Judges who are wanted elsewhere, the blame of it can hardly be laid at Mr. RIDSDALE's door. He has not been prosecuted at his own request or for his own pleasure. He would have been perfectly content if the Church Association, or the "aggrieved" parishioners whom they inspire, would have left him alone. Nor is it for Mr. RIDSDALE's convenience that the Court

has been made to include so many eminent Judges. The peace of the Established Church is a matter of at least equal importance with the going to sea of a particular ship or the interpretation of a particular contract; and the peace of the Established Church very largely depends on the proceedings now in progress before the Judicial Committee. Whether the judgment in the *PURCHAS* case is affirmed or amended, it is well that it should be affirmed or amended by a Court whose ability, impartiality, and various knowledge can be disputed by no one. No doubt the question raised might be decided by fewer than ten Judges. But in ecclesiastical appeals it is well that the Court should be comprehensive as well as competent. People might say, if they disliked the result, that Lord CAIRNS had thought more of clerical votes than of legal principles, or that Lord SELBORNE had not entirely put off his theological partisanship. When their judgment is supported by men like Lord Justice JAMES or Sir JAMES COLLVILLE, there will be no room for any such imputation. To determine the ritual of the Church of England may be an unimportant function in itself; but it is not unimportant when the satisfactory working of the ecclesiastical system requires that it shall be determined justly, wisely, and once for all. If this result is obtained and accepted, the country will have no cause to quarrel with an arrangement which has for the space of a week rolled half-a-dozen Courts into one.

The ten Judges might all have been free to give their minds to the hearing of purely secular causes without the discontent which is felt being appreciably lessened. It is not an accidental obstruction, lasting for a day or two, that suitors quarrel with. Their indignation is directed against the more serious and permanent obstruction which is caused by the want of a judicial staff adequate to the work that has to be got through. The MASTER of the ROLLS said on Tuesday that there would be scarcely business enough for the Judges of the Chancery Division if it were confined to the assigned business of that division. The block, so far as it existed, was attributable to the persistence of suitors in bringing Common Law actions in the Chancery Division. It is not a bad measure of the progress that has been made in law reform that the Court of Chancery should have become too popular. Sir GEORGE JESSEL perhaps holds that the presumptuous suitor who dares to come for justice to the Court which he thinks will be most certain to give it him ought to be subjected to some legal penalty; but in these early days of the Judicature Act, it is by no means an evil that the comparative merits of the procedure in the two great divisions of the High Court of Justice should be tested by the preference shown to one or other of them by those who have the power to take their business into either. Two reasons for this run upon the Chancery Division were suggested in the ROLLS. Sir GEORGE JESSEL accounted for it by the fact that the Judges of the Chancery Division possessed establishments enabling them to work out cases tried before them which the Common Law Divisions did not. Mr. ROXBURGH thought that many suitors came to the Chancery rather than to the Common Law Divisions, because in the Chancery Division they could get their cases tried by a judge without a jury. Both these explanations point to real defects in the procedure of the Common Law Divisions. The Chancery Chief Clerks are even more overworked than the Judges, and the block in Chambers is greater than the block in Court. If suitors were prevented from bringing Common Law actions in the Chancery Division, they would be forced to bring them in divisions which possess no establishments for working them out. This is not a state of things which it is desirable to encourage, because, if a case is tried without such an establishment, the result can seldom be satisfactory to either party. There is no reason why all the work that is done by the Chief Clerks in the Chancery Division should not be done by similar officers in the Common Law Divisions. In many such the decree of the Judge is the least part of the battle, the real conflict being in the settlement of details before the Chief Clerk. If Common Law actions could be referred to a similar authority, one motive for crowding more business into the Chancery Division than it can properly discharge would be removed. The other reason suggested was the power that Chancery suitors have of dispensing with a jury if they prefer to have their case tried by a Judge. It argues exaggerated devotion to the principle of trial by jury to insist upon its application to causes to which it is not really suited, or even not suited

in the estimation of the parties. It is easy to imagine circumstances in which the opinion of a trained Judge upon certain facts would carry much more conviction with it than the opinion of twelve untrained jurymen; and it is not obvious why suitors should be forbidden from asking a Common Law Judge to decide upon facts as well as upon law, when the result of the prohibition is not to lead them to accept a jury, but simply to send them elsewhere to find a Judge.

Still, if the erring suitors who insist on tasting the sweets of Chancery were all compelled to put up with the plainer fare of the Common Law, it does not appear that the block in the Law Courts would be any the less. The MASTER of the ROLLS says that, if Chancery Judges had only Chancery business to do, they would have more than time to do it in. They are overworked because they have to try Common Law cases as well. But the Common Law Judges are not left to sit with their hands before them. The block in the Chancery Division has not emptied the Common Law Divisions. More work is even now thrown upon them than they can properly get through; and how much worse would not their condition be if all the business that has been transferred to the Chancery Division were suddenly sent back to whence it came. Changes which went no further than to restore to the Common Law Courts the popularity which, by the side of the Court of Chancery, they have to some extent lost, might relieve the Chancery Division, but it would only do so by throwing additional labour upon the Common Law Divisions; and, as the existence of a block is certainly not unknown even here, no real improvement would have been effected. After all that has been said, the real cause of the delays of justice, and of the denials of justice which so often result from delay, is, that there is not machinery enough to do the work that there is to be done. Even if Sir GEORGE JESSEL's dream were realized, and an officer of the Court stood with a drawn sword at the gate of the Chancery paradise to warn off the wayward suitors who wish to force an entrance, more Judges would be wanted in one or other division. It is not necessary to go the length of saying with "An Old Practitioner" in the *Times* that there are a hundred barristers in each of the two great divisions who would make excellent Judges. It is enough to say that there is the material in each division for quite as many Judges as there is any need for. It is a mistake to suppose that, to be a good Judge, a man must possess either extraordinary abilities or extraordinary knowledge of law. Very great eminence in one of these directions will sometimes cover a deficiency in the other; but something more than the average of both qualifications will suffice to make a very decent Judge. When it is remembered how greatly a Judge is helped by the arguments of counsel, and how many cases there are in which it is of far greater importance that the law should be declared than that it should be declared in any particular way, it is allowable to believe that the English Bar would yield at least five more Judges of equal merit with the majority of those now on the Bench.

THE HOME RULE PARTY.

THE opportunity of administering a rebuff to Lord HARTINGTON must have been delightful to the Home Rule mind; but the member who issues the circulars of the Liberal party may well have doubted whether the exclusion of the Irish members from his list would be regarded as a compliment or an affront. Experience has shown that the House of Commons naturally divides itself into two parties, though a third has sometimes been temporarily interposed between the two extremes. The followers of Lord GRENVILLE fifty years ago at last gave in their adhesion to Lord LIVERPOOL's Government; and within comparatively recent memory the Peelites were merged in the general body of Liberals. The Irish supporters of Home Rule are perhaps numerous enough to assert for themselves a separate position; but their solitary article of faith affords them little guidance in the discussions which ordinarily occupy the attention of Parliament. Although they may profess to stand apart, the greater number of them are for all purposes extreme Liberals, and they naturally vote in accordance with their opinions. Lord HARTINGTON has perhaps given offence by his manly declarations against the dismemberment of the United

Kingdom; but it was not for him to assume that Home Rule members cared nothing for the domestic and foreign interests of the general community. In the debates and possible divisions on the Turkish policy of the Government, the Irish members will probably take part; and it may be supposed that their judgment will not be biased by any reference to the wholly irrelevant issue of Home Rule. The half-dozen English members who condescended to secure their seats by flattering the prejudices of Irish workmen in their respective boroughs belong without exception to the Liberal party. It is true that at Manchester a Conservative candidate incurred a merited defeat after he had attempted to bid against his Radical competitor for the vote of the Irish section of the constituency; but the local managers of the Home Rule party, having satisfied themselves by humiliating both Conservatives and Liberals, gave their hearty and undivided support to the advocate of revolutionary doctrines. Major O'GORMAN and his friends will probably not be troubled with any further issue of Liberal circulars; but there is no reason to suppose that they will change the political course which they have hitherto pursued. On the Eastern question they may possibly be divided between the jealousy of the Eastern Church which influences the Roman Catholic priesthood, and the enlightened antipathy to England which makes the Fenians the professed allies either of Russia or of any other Power which is supposed to be adverse to the national policy. Even if the supporters of Home Rule were to agree to throw their united weight into either scale, they would find themselves on the same side with either a majority or a minority of the Liberal party. It is well known that many of Mr. GLADSTONE's former followers disapprove of his recent proceedings, although his policy will be formally sanctioned by the leaders of the party. The Irish popularity which Mr. GLADSTONE acquired by the abolition of the Church Establishment and by the Land Act has been impaired, and perhaps obliterated, by his polemical attacks on the POPE. His most devoted adherents have always regretted the unnecessary provocation which he has offered to his former Irish supporters.

Irish agitators, including more than one member of the House of Commons, have often attempted to pledge the Home Rule party either to total abstention from attendance in Parliament, or to a systematic interruption of public business; but a body which includes several intelligent and ambitious politicians is not easily persuaded to renounce both the respect of the House of Commons and the opportunity of acquiring legitimate distinction. The temptation of trying to secure influence by offering support alternately to contending parties has been greatly diminished for the time by the result of the last general election. The Home Rule members can no longer defeat the Government by voting with the Opposition, and consequently they are not able to command their own terms from either party. The change in their position soon produced its natural consequences. In the last Parliament Mr. GLADSTONE so far approached to a compromise as to announce that he was not able to understand what Home Rule meant. In other words, he was ready to accept any plausible explanation which might ostensibly disguise the real purpose of separation. No similar attempt to tamper with a destructive project has been made since the election by any leader of the Liberal party. Home Rule has consequently not become an open question, though the number of its Irish supporters is rather increased than diminished. Even on local questions the members of the Home Rule section display a wholesome difference of opinion. The majority of their body voted for the Bill for closing Irish public-houses on Sunday, and the Government promised to defer to the decision of the House of Commons; but Major O'GORMAN delivered an eloquent protest against the innovation, on the plausible ground that Irish farmers, according to his statement, never cared to drink hard except on Sunday. Even on the main question of the establishment of a separate Irish Legislature the adversaries of English supremacy are not unanimous. One of the most eloquent speeches of the last Session was delivered by Mr. SMYTH in support of a repeal of the Union, which is plainly distinguishable from Mr. BUTT's plan of Home Rule, although either measure might probably produce the same practical results. As usual in such cases, minor sectarian differences excited warmer feelings of antagonism than the broad distinction between union and separation. To the orthodox Home Ruler Mr. SMYTH is either a heretic or a rash betrayer of mysteries which ought to be concealed; while

the English Liberal or Conservative occupies the comparatively inoffensive position of a mere stranger or heathen. The genuine Repealer who wishes to restore the independence of 1782 does Mr. BUTT the disservice of deducing from the principles of Home Rule their necessary consequences. The dream or pretence of a federal connexion between Great Britain and Ireland enables English candidates for Irish votes in large towns to affect a belief in the possibility of entrusting local Irish affairs to the management of a subordinate Parliament framed on the model of an American State Legislature. Mr. SMYTH's revived Irish Parliament would not, even in profession, recognize Imperial supremacy, although the two countries would still be nominally connected by the Crown. The experiment has once failed, after eighteen or nineteen years of trial; and it is therefore thought expedient by more cautious politicians than Mr. SMYTH to repeat it with a judicious change of name and form.

When Major O'GORMAN earnestly assured Lord HARTINGTON that the Home Rule party had a leader of its own, he perhaps may not have been aware of circumstances which, unless they can be removed, may involve his friends in some temporary embarrassment. Mr. BUTT is still devoted to Home Rule; but he has begun to doubt whether he can afford to continue the personal sacrifices which he has made to the cause. There is no doubt that regular attendance on Parliament inflicts a heavy loss on an Irish barrister in good practice. Scotch advocates, for the most part, avoid similar inconvenience by not entering the House of Commons, except when they have an early prospect of office. Irish members who nominally belong to the profession are often at liberty to absent themselves from business which is not pressing; but there is no doubt that Mr. BUTT might considerably increase his income by remaining in Dublin during the Session. It has for some time past been expected that the O'CONNELL tribute would be revived, if possible, in favour of his professed successor; but no practical steps have hitherto been taken to provide for the Home Rule leader. The priests, of whom many are but doubtful supporters of Mr. BUTT's scheme, may perhaps not have been willing to undertake the task of making parochial collections for a Protestant patriot. The upper classes with one consent object to the projects of demagogues and agitators; and some nominal supporters of Home Rule are not enthusiastic in the cause. The task of stimulating the sluggish liberality of the party has been commenced with energy and adroitness. Paragraphs were inserted in the papers with the purpose of creating a belief that the vacant post of Chief Justice would perhaps be offered to Mr. BUTT by a Government which was represented as eager to buy off a formidable adversary. It was of course added that Mr. BUTT was incapable of abandoning his country under any temptation which could be offered; but the imaginary rejection of a pretended overture, while it increased his claim to the confidence of his followers, suggested the reflection that he could not reasonably be expected to incur heavy losses without some compensation. O'CONNELL also was said to have refused high judicial office; nor can there be any doubt that he might have commanded a high price from the Whig Government of the day for withdrawal from agitation. The present Government would certainly not think of promoting Mr. BUTT to the Bench; but it is for his admirers to consider whether they are bound to make good his loss of professional practice. When the report about the Chief Justiceship had been allowed time to operate on the feelings of the Home Rule party, the journals which had circulated the rumour began to express apprehension that the country might perhaps be deprived of Mr. BUTT's invaluable services. Mr. MITCHELL-HENRY has, in a published letter, both dilated on the greatness of the risk and suggested the mode by which it may be averted. A short time will show whether it is possible to reproduce in the present day the institution of the O'CONNELL Rent. It is not desirable that the income of a party leader should depend on his success in consulting the prejudices of the people; but Mr. BUTT and his admirers are not likely to trouble themselves with considerations of public expediency.

LORD DUFFERIN AT TORONTO.

IF a sense of humour were more easily brought out by competitive examination, it ought to be strictly exacted as one of the indispensable qualifications for the public service. The

ability to make a joke, or, failing that, the humbler faculty of taking one, is often of inestimable value to a high official. It was one of the secrets of Lord PALMERSTON's popularity; it has saved Mr. LOWE from much of the dislike which his singular power of giving offence would otherwise have brought on him; and it would appreciably lessen the number of Mr. GLADSTONE's post-cards. It is not very easy to feel angry with a Minister when you have just been laughing over the unexpected turns and quaint analogies of his speech. And even if you do feel angry with him, it is an anger of a human and kindly sort. He belongs to the same clay as other men, is a sharer in the same weaknesses, is not too free from the same faults. Lord DUFFERIN has been giving an excellent example of the political use to which humour can be turned. Since he has been Governor-General of CANADA, he has had ample experience of the thorns which such an office can gather round it. Difficulties of many kinds have come across him, and nothing but the exercise of the utmost tact and discretion would have carried him safely past them. When we read his speech at the National Club dinner at Toronto, we cease to wonder that he has surmounted them so well. There is a union of good sense and fun about it which seems to make the puzzle plain. The worst thing that a constitutional ruler, be he governor or king, can possibly do is to magnify his office, and Lord DUFFERIN's sense of humour has effectually guarded him against this snare. He describes, in the spirit of a true political philosopher, the negative and unsensational character of a Governor-General's duties. His principal achievement, he said, is to prevent mischief rather than to accomplish good. The best parts even of his speeches are those which he is discreet enough to leave unsaid. He is the depository of a power which, though very great, is altogether latent, and is never suffered to become active. "His ordinary duties are very similar to those of the man we see tending some complicated piece of machinery, who goes about clad in fustian, with a little tin can having a long spout to it, and pouring a drop of oil here and another there."

This description of the position and functions of a constitutional sovereign, and of a constitutional sovereign's representative, is excellently suited to the occasion on which it was given. It is not every one who can throw so much sound political philosophy into so amusing a form; and what better becomes a statesman after dinner than philosophy combined with amusement? The people among whom the speech was delivered had also to be considered; and Lord DUFFERIN seems to have hit very happily the combination of monarchical theory with democratic practice which is presented by a prosperous English colony. The Canadians know so well that they govern themselves that they can afford to play with the idea that they are governed by a Viceroy. To a people in this contented mood there is something especially appropriate in Lord DUFFERIN's estimate of his position. They feel that from a Governor of this temper they get the solid advantages alike of independence and guidance. The machine goes on in its appointed course, and the man in fustian is powerless to control or check its action. But he is not powerless to smoothe its action. The oil which he administers is but an infinitesimal fraction of the forces which keep the work in motion, but it is a fraction that could not be withdrawn without immense waste and friction. Even in England the service which a constitutional sovereign renders to the progress of public business at critical moments is of inestimable value, and in a colony a wise Governor has still more frequent opportunities of playing the same part. The storms of Parliamentary life in a colony are often tropical in their intensity. There is not the long Parliamentary tradition which does so much to bridle the torques of English politicians, while there is the more intimate acquaintance with one another which gives even political conflicts so much of a personal character. Under these circumstances the Governor-General of CANADA is constantly useful as an intermediary between parties whose unchecked contact would convulse the Dominion. In fact, he acts as a sort of breakwater against which the waves can beat without injury, and as the commotion dies away he can usually see how the force of seemingly opposing currents which, if they had been allowed to meet, would have wrought nothing but disaster, can be directed to the public good. Canadians have a more or less clear perception of all this,

and see that in Lord DUFFERIN's hands there is no danger that these useful functions will be perverted by any unwise ambition to make his position greater. They can afford to give a hearty support to the ruler whose estimate of his office consorts so well with their own. They feel that, if there were no Governor-General in whose presence the fierce party strifes of the Dominion could be content to reduce themselves to proportions which are not incompatible with the peaceful conduct of public business and the tranquil working of political institutions, they might be in a worse way than they are.

How important it is to have an Executive which is raised above party politics has been shown by the recent example of the United States; and this history conveys a further lesson in the enormous difficulty which there is under a Republican Government in securing an Executive that shall be raised above politics. It can be had no doubt when great abilities are combined with high character and with an accurate appreciation of the nature of the Presidential position. If circumstances had made Prince ALBERT or King LEOPOLD President of the United States or of the French Republic, they would have shown the same superiority to personal or official ambition. But characters of this mark are not to be had every day; and the opposite kind of spectacle has been presented with singular distinctness by General GRANT. For a period that in the life of the American people may pass as long the President of the United States has been little more than the President of the successful party. The office is not surrounded with those traditions which raise it above the political contests that are always raging at Washington, and the defect can only be made up by a rare combination of qualities in the occupant. General GRANT had an extraordinary opportunity of making such a position for himself, since his popularity with his countrymen had been gained in the field, and he might have begun political life with a most unusual freedom from political entanglements. The result of his administration, alike to his own reputation and to that of the United States, is a lesson to politicians who wish to make the Executive the creature of their own passions, instead of their curb. Lord DUFFERIN described with truth and eloquence the part which an Executive ought to play as "a representative of all that is august, stable, and sedate in the government, the history, and the traditions of the country; incapable of partisanship, and lifted far above the atmosphere of faction; without adherents to reward or opponents to oust from office, docile to the suggestions of his Ministers, and yet securing to the people the certainty of being able to get rid of an Administration or a Parliament the moment either have forfeited their confidence." It is a description which may well make the people of Canada contented with their lot. As Lord DUFFERIN justly said, the self-restraint and moderation exhibited by the American people under a most trying and difficult situation deserve the admiration and imitation of the civilized world, but the Canadians may well congratulate themselves upon the good fortune which has saved them from a similar ordeal.

LEGAL BLUNDERING.

THE failure of the prosecution of SLADE the medium at the Middlesex Sessions, not on the question of the truth of the charges against him—for that was not gone into—but on a small technical point, has naturally created some surprise; but it is quite in keeping with the general course of incapacity and blundering which has lately been so conspicuous on the part of the legal representatives of the Government. There is scarcely a single case, even of the least importance and the most ordinary kind, in which they have not gone perversely wrong. Nothing could be more ignorant and imbecile than the first absurd Slave Circular, and the rest of the series has betrayed an equal helplessness in grasping the practical elements of the question. In the case of the illegal imprisonment and ill-usage of English seamen by the Peruvian Government, the ATTORNEY-GENERAL distinguished himself by a bitter and unjustifiable attack on his own countrymen at a moment when they were in great danger, which was in fact a direct encouragement to the Peruvians to believe that, as far as the English Government was concerned, they could do what they liked with the poor fellows; and indeed it actually had that effect. Again, on the question of

the Extradition Treaty with the United States, the Foreign Office was, as usual, misled by its legal advisers, who, after an obstinate and muddle-headed resistance to the arguments on the other side, had to submit to the humiliation of acknowledging themselves utterly in the wrong, and proposing a renewal of the treaty. Similar obtuseness and want of tact and judgment were observable in the *Franconia* case, and in smaller matters there has been uniform and consistent bungling. The BRAVO inquest was diverted from the strict lines of judicial inquiry in order to make a sensational trial, and to provide sport for a morbid curiosity; the medical student who undertook to instruct a lady how to poison any one in an easy way without fear of detection was indicted under the wrong Act, and got off with a trifling sentence, instead of the heavy penalty which his crime deserved; and here again, in the SLADE case, there has been another melancholy example of professional incompetence. There cannot be two opinions as to the blunder which was committed by the counsel for the Treasury in taking such a liberty with the language of a clause in an Act of Parliament as to leave out words which formed an evidently essential element in the definition of a criminal offence. Apart from this, the clause had been set out fully in the police proceedings, and the prosecution had no right to alter the charge without the sanction of the Court to which the appeal was carried. The clause in the Vagrant Act enacts that every person "pretending or professing to tell fortunes, or using any subtle craft, means, or device, by palmistry or otherwise, to deceive or impose on any of his Majesty's subjects, shall be deemed a rogue and a vagabond within the meaning of the Act"; and it is obvious that the words "by palmistry or otherwise" are essential as indicating the character of the craft or device intended by the statute. The ASSISTANT-JUDGE showed very clearly that the clause must be taken as a whole, and that, if the words in question could be made to apply to the acts alleged, there was no reason for leaving them out while, on the other hand, if they did not apply, the offence was avowedly wanting in a material element. Of course a blunder of this kind might have occurred through a casual slip and inadvertence, and then nothing would have been easier than to get it amended. Even as it was, the Judge repeatedly offered to allow the omitted words to be replaced; but the prosecuting counsel declared that the omission was a deliberate act, and that he stood by it, and accordingly refused to yield. It is of course not an uncommon thing that some of the charges made in the first instance against a prisoner are dropped on appeal; but what the prosecutor did in this case was not merely to drop a link in his chain of evidence, but to alter the statutory specification of a particular offence so as to suit his own convenience. It is certainly difficult to understand how any barrister of experience, with his wits about him, could put himself into such an obviously false position, and still more why he should foolishly persist in sticking there, and throw up the case rather than set himself right.

When the conviction by the police magistrate was thus squashed, an intimation was given on behalf of the Treasury that an application would be made to the Court of Queen's Bench to compel the hearing of the case; but it is, we suppose, improbable that this will now be done, as the original promoters of the prosecution at Bow Street have resolved to try it again, with charges in another form. The indictment now accuses SLADE of obtaining money under false pretences, and SLADE and his agent SIMMONS together of a conspiracy for this purpose. It is needless to say that this change of form does not necessarily imply that the acts charged against SLADE could not be brought under the definition of "palmistry or otherwise." Palmistry in itself implies a pretended divination by looking at the lines of a person's palm; and in that respect there is no resemblance between the trickery imputed to SLADE and that which used to be carried on under the name of palmistry. But the "otherwise" which is tacked to "palmistry" widens the scope of the definition, and seems to include anything in the nature of that "subtle craft, means, or device," of which palmistry is mentioned as a conspicuous instance. We have no intention, of course, of expressing an opinion as to how far the particular devices attributed to SLADE can be brought home to him; but it may fairly be argued that, as described, they belong to much the same class of impostures as fortune-telling, whether by the inspection of the hand or dealing cards. In fact,

whatever technical name or classification may be given to it, SLADE's alleged offence is simply this, that he pretends that messages written by his own or some other human hand on a slate are written by the spirit of his deceased wife, ALLIE. On one side there is the evidence of two apparently competent and trustworthy witnesses who obtained a sight of the slate while the party was supposed, according to SLADE, to be waiting for the spirit to begin scratching with the slate-pencil. On the other hand, there is, it is understood, the evidence of any number of other witnesses who saw other manifestations produced by SLADE, and implicitly believe in their genuineness; but this sort of testimony does not relate to the actual incidents on which the charge is based, but to other incidents which may have happened under other circumstances. It is to be hoped that in the new proceedings, which are, it is said, to take place before Sir J. INGHAM, the chief magistrate at Bow Street, instead of his colleague, Mr. FLOWERS, the evidence admitted will be strictly limited to the question which has been raised—that is, whether on one particular occasion SLADE's mode of operation was really detected by two observers, who are telling honestly what they saw. At the former inquiry in the police court a great deal of irrelevant evidence was admitted on both sides, and much time needlessly and improperly wasted. The fact that a conjuror could perform, by sleight of hand or mechanical contrivances, tricks similar to SLADE's so-called manifestations, does not by itself necessarily prove that there is nothing more in the latter than ordinary conjuring; for there may be other means of producing such effects, or of deluding visitors into an impression that such effects are produced. On the other hand, what SLADE may have done, or have appeared to do, at other times does not directly contradict the testimony of those who were present on a particular occasion. It may be that the alleged discovery of SLADE's operations by Professor LANKESTER and Dr. DONKIN was through accidental carelessness on his part, or some unexpected derangement of his plans; and that, as a rule, he is successful in convincing spectators of the reality of his spiritual communications. However this may be, the issue to be decided may be brought in this case within a very narrow compass. It is a question, not whether there is anything in Spiritualism generally, but whether a particular artifice was practised by a particular medium on a specified day or days. A great deal has been made of a report on one of SLADE's *séances*, in which a well-known minor Judge attests that he saw a bell move all by itself across a table, and that a spirit-hand of a fleshy touch tickled his legs; but he did not attempt to test the substantiality of these appearances which he thought he saw, though he says they passed close to him, by seizing hold of them, as the two doctors did of the slate; and this makes a distinction between the two kinds of evidence, one of which is confined to pure observation, while the other brings the grip of physical contact into the account. We need hardly repeat that, in touching on these points, we are not attempting to forecast the final decision, but merely to point out what seems to us the natural course and limits of the inquiry.

EDUCATION IN EGYPT.

SIGHT-SEERS in Cairo who have no particular taste for infanticide suffer considerably during their first few excursions from the fear of immolating at least one small Egyptian during each day's ride. How the children escape it would be impossible to say, for every place is creeping with them. It is hard to believe that sackfuls of them are not imported each morning from the surrounding Arab villages and emptied into the streets, so that the little waifs may seek their own livelihood, like the Pariah dogs. Yet, strange to say, though bazaars and mosques, roads and rubbish-heaps, swarms with children, a considerable number of the Cairene youth are actually at school. No one but a Spiritualist could be asked to believe this fact without proof. To get correct statistics on the subject of education in Egypt is not easy. The Minister of Instruction can only collect his information with considerable difficulty, and cannot always be sure of the strict accuracy of the returns he makes, particularly with regard to distant provinces. In many cases a *fakeeh*, when made aware that his school would be inspected on a certain day, calmly dismissed his scholars, locked the door, and went for a day's excursion. The Minister has, however, succeeded in obtaining some important statistics, from which we find that there are at present 140,977 pupils under instruction. Of these 111,803 are in primary Arab schools, 15,335 in those attached to mosques, 1,385 are educated by Government, 8,961 by missions and religious communities, and 2,960 in the municipal

schools. There are only two female schools returned, those started by the Khedive; but in the Copt and Mission schools little girls may be found, though very few indeed—a mere drop in the ocean of ignorance. It will easily be seen that the primary Arab schools educate more than two-thirds of the children, and that they consequently are of the first interest to any one anxious for the improvement of the national culture. Unfortunately they seem to exist only in order to impart a parrot-like acquaintance with the text of the Koran. For this purpose only have they been endowed by pious people. Any one fresh from seeing an infant school in England would feel a sense of utter bewilderment in entering one in Cairo. Everything is topsy-turvy. The children read and write from left to right, and even begin to learn their sole lesson-book, the Koran, backwards, because the latter chapters are easier and more important. The consequence is that, after a few visits to Arab schools, one cannot help a feeling of surprise when a child sneezes, or shows that he is changing his teeth at the same age as a little European.

One primary school in Cairo is well worth having a peep into. You open a door in the street, and find a room about ten feet square. It is below the level of the road, and lofty for its size. A grated window, high up, gives a dim light; but a flood of sunshine comes in at the open door, and strikes full on the bright crimson robe of the *fakēh* as he sits on his cushion in the corner. At one end stands the only piece of furniture in the room. It looks like a large harmonium done up in brown holland; but turns out to be a box containing the bones of a saint. In front of this curious piece of school furniture squat four-and-twenty little black and brown boys. One or two are disguised as girls, to protect them from the evil eye. All have dirty faces, and several are suffering from ophthalmia. They sit in two rows, facing each other, and simultaneously rock their bodies violently backwards and forwards as they recite the alphabet, or that verse of the Koran which forms their day's task. The children shout at the top of their little cracked voices in a nasal tone far from musical. The noise they contrive to make is astounding, considering how small they are. If they cease their rocking and shrieking, even for a moment, the master brings down his long palm cane upon their shaven skulls, and they recommence with renewed energy, and an even more violent see-saw. The sentence repeated does not convey the slightest meaning to their minds, nor is any attempt made to explain it. Two or three older children are sitting beside the *fakēh*, getting lessons in the formation of the Arabic characters. Their copy-book is a piece of bright tin, and they use a reed pen called a *kalam*. The ink bottle is a box containing a sponge saturated with some brown fluid. A long row of tiny slippers, of every form and colour, lie neatly arranged at the door; for the place where the bones of a saint are enshrined is holy ground, and no one may soil the clean matting of the floor with outside defilement. No register is kept of the pupils, or of their days of attendance. Indeed, although the *fakēh* can repeat the whole of the Koran off book, it is highly probable he would find some difficulty in counting up to the number of his scholars. His acquirements begin and end with a textual knowledge of the sacred book, and unfortunately the wishes of his pupils' parents with regard to the education of their children are bounded by the same narrow limits.

If an Arab primary school in a large town like Cairo only gives such rudimentary instruction, the state of schools situated in far-away country villages may easily be imagined. A visit to most of them is by no means a pleasant experience, for the fuel used by the fellahs makes any approach to their habitations most unpleasant. If, however, one can altogether suppress the sense of smell, a good deal of amusement is to be had in penetrating into the homes of these poor, oppressed, hardworking natives. There is no doubt that much may be done to improve matters if the Khedive continues to take the same interest that he does at present in organizing and inspecting the means of education provided for his people. Already the municipal schools have been placed on the same footing as the preparatory Government establishments with regard to their code of instruction. This gives them a solid basis for the future. But to inspect a little Arab school in a poor district is really sad. In the first place, all the villages are deplorably wretched, and the women look dirty and degraded. As soon as a stranger is seen coming, all the inhabitants turn out *en masse* to follow him about. They kick up clouds of dust, bring thousands of flies, and altogether make themselves highly unpleasant. The visitor is jostled along through several mud lanes with holes on either side, covered by doors which seem to have been made by a prehistoric carpenter with neolithic implements. The nearly stifled sight-seer at last arrives at the village academy. It is perhaps a mud-hole without a door, and in it he finds three or four bright-eyed boys, a turkey-cock, and a few pigeons. The show pupil begins to read at the top of his voice the one piece of his lesson-book which he has managed to acquire. The other pupils listen admiringly. He rocks backwards and forward, as is the custom of the country; but when he becomes fully conscious how large and distinguished is his audience, the rapidity of his pendulum motion becomes alarming. It appears only a question of time how long it can continue before he breaks in two. There is, however, no appearance of any director to his studies, but a blind man sitting on a stone in the street turns out to be the village schoolmaster. The *fakēh's* face beams with a proper pride in his establishment. He evidently finds nothing surprising in strangers from a far country coming to call on him. They have, no doubt, heard of his learning. He only regrets that several of his

pupils are playing truant because of the great feast which is to be held the ensuing week. These schoolmasters are miserably paid, mostly in kind, for piastres are scarce; but they exercise considerable influence, and no marriage or family fête is complete without their presence.

In better-class Arab schools a little arithmetic is sometimes taught, but not always. Boys who wish to pursue that branch of their education generally learn from the public *gabāni*, a man whose business it is to weigh merchandize. A child whose father keeps a shop is taught by assisting in it. Geography is also neglected, which is fortunate, as nothing can be more ludicrous than the lessons when they are attempted. The teaching is of course entirely based upon the Koran, which upholds Mr. Hampden's views with regard to the shape of the earth. The children learn that it takes five hundred years of travelling to get round the mighty plain, whilst perhaps a few yards from the school door hangs one of Mr. Cook's placards offering to do the whole business in ninety days. It must be a little hard to explain all about the seven earths and the seven heavens, and the seven climates and the seven seas of light, with their curtains; so it may be just as well to leave it alone. The one important fact which the children retain is that Mecca is the centre of the earth. But these schools are all now under Government inspection, and it is impossible to say what reforms may not be accomplished during the next few years. One of the first steps ought to be to arrange the pupils in classes. At present each boy comes to the master with his lesson, says it, and returns to his seat. He is succeeded by another, and so on during the whole day. This would be impossible if more than reading and writing were taught. The apparent want of discipline in all Egyptian schools partly arises from this custom. It is not anarchy that reigns, but simple confusion. The children who are brought up to respect and obey their parents are really entirely under the control of the schoolmaster, and obey the slightest command without hesitation. It is the loud continuous hum of voices and the constant going to and fro of the pupils which make the schools appear such a bazaar.

Of the mosque schools the ancient El Azhar is still the most important. It provides instruction, such as it is, for more than eleven thousand pupils. A considerable number are housed and fed within its hospitable walls. The scholars are of all ages, and come from the most remote provinces as well as the larger towns. They may stay as long as they like and go there when they please. If they are rich they make presents to the professors, who are paid entirely by voluntary donations; if they are very poor, they receive help from their *Alma Mater* in the shape of food. The *bakshesh* of five hundred sheep sent one day by the Viceroy on the occasion of a family rejoicing was therefore not unacceptable. The school is, in fact, a great free national university for the teaching of the theology of the Koran. There are few rules; there is no compulsory course of study; there is no roll-call or classification of students. Curiously enough, coffee and tobacco are forbidden within the walls; but, no doubt, the students rich enough to have rooms outside make up for the deprivation by an extra allowance at home. With regard to the education, Dor Bey, the Minister of Instruction, holds that the importance which is attached to the cultivation of a mere mechanical memory is fatal to the development of the intelligence of the pupils and to progress in general. He says that the stupid scholar learns by rote without imbibing any ideas, and that the naturally clever boy is entirely crushed and suppressed by this system. The professors suffer as much as their pupils; and he tells of one who could repeat the whole of the Introduction of Porphry to the works of Aristotle, yet remains convinced that the book itself was written by the great Sheikh Isagougi. Some of the Coptic schools are well worthy of a visit. The principal one in Cairo is exceedingly well attended. The boys look as if their intelligence was cultivated, and many of them read and speak either French or English with ease and a good accent. They seem to have a great interest in each other, and to feel a genuine pride in seeing their companions show off their small accomplishments to strangers. The Copts take some pains to teach their girls, and have two fairly well managed schools at Cairo. The children are taught reading, writing, arithmetic, singing, and needlework. They evidently enjoy their lessons, and we may say, with Thackeray, that

He can't but smile who traces
The smiles on those brown faces
And the pretty prattling graces
Of these small heathens gay,

except that the Copts are commonly Christians.

Mehemet Ali was the original founder of the Government schools. He started them for the purpose of improving the state of his army. To carry out his ambitious projects, he found that it was necessary to have officers of intelligence, trained doctors, able heads of the commissariat. He must train his soldiers by educating them. So successful was the college to which he sent his own sons that at one time it contained fifteen hundred students. But the Hattî Sherif of 1841 was the death-blow to education in Egypt for the time being. The schools rapidly deteriorated, for they had taken no hold upon the national life. When Abbas Pasha ascended the throne, he commanded a general examination of both pupils and masters to be held. So grossly ignorant did he find them that he ordered all the schools to be at once closed. Ismail Pasha, however, perceiving that it was not alone for the sake of the army that it was desirable to organize some system of education, has been doing all he can to encourage

it. There is a certain military and French tone about the Government schools still, but the boys are well taught, and always learn some language besides their own. The boys wear a uniform, the principal number are boarders, and the "externs" seem to be paid to come. Half the pupils, when they leave, enter Government service in some way or other. The experiment was tried of sending a considerable number of the most promising young men to finish their education in Europe; but the plan did not succeed so well as might have been hoped. They did not seem to have energy or enterprise to make use of their advantages. A young man would perhaps gain a good diploma in medicine at Paris, but on his return would never dream of setting up as a physician. On the contrary, he would be much disappointed if not presented to a lucrative Government situation.

Perhaps the most hopeful sign of real progress with regard to education in Egypt is to be found in the schools for girls lately established in Cairo. One of the princesses takes a great interest in them, and it seems that the Khedive has given a handsome endowment. The larger of the two is in a fine old palace, which is admirably suited to the purpose on account of the number of large airy rooms it contains. There is an inner courtyard, and perfect ventilation and shelter from the summer sun. The dormitories are beautifully clean, and each child has her own bed. The kitchen, although savage-looking enough, would be a treasure in a modern London house, because all round there is a sort of double roof over the fireplaces which draws the smell up the chimneys. The cooking is by no means to be despised; nor does it discredit the handsome Nubian cooks, who show their white teeth with delight when their messes are tasted and approved. The children look clean, happy, diligent, and healthy. The punishments for bad conduct are bread and water, forfeiting holidays, and standing on a form. The bastinado seems to have disappeared from nearly all the schools. One little Egyptian, a model of beauty and grace, was on her stool of repentance as we passed through the courtyard. Her head, covered with short curly hair, came out in high relief against the whitewashed wall, and might have been the original of one of the statues in the Boulak Museum. The ugly European dress could not conceal the beauty of her lithe figure. Her small, delicately formed brown hands were clasped together, and seemed to shine on her white apron. She looked so appealingly out of her long thickly fringed eyes that it was impossible not to beg that she might be pardoned, particularly as she did not look in the least naughty. The directress of the school is a Syrian, and seems a person of remarkable character. Her least word is law, and yet the children smile when she speaks to them as if they loved her. Female education and normal schools seem to be the two things now wanting to give a firm hold to what has already been done for education in Egypt. It is a cheering fact that the heir-apparent, Tarfik Pasha, has started a very fine school which is admirably managed, and promises to be a model establishment.

THE DOCTRINE OF RACE.

WHEN any new doctrine, any new way of looking at things, gets beyond the range of scientific students and gains any degree of general influence, it commonly goes through several phases. In its contact with the unscientific multitude it is sure to get to some extent distorted, exaggerated, and misapplied. Then the scientific man steps in to correct the errors of the multitude, to bring the misconceived truth back into its proper place. In so doing there is always a certain danger of the common results of a reaction. It is quite possible that the scientific man, nettled at the mistake of the multitude, may really in his own mind push his contradiction too far, and may, in getting rid of the error, get rid of some truth along with it. He may forget that a popular view of anything is seldom mere error. It is far more commonly a half truth, one truth looked at by itself without regard to its relation to other truths. Even if he does not do this in his own mind, he lies under a great temptation, in protesting against a popular misconception, to use language which, if it does not mislead himself, may still mislead others. In protesting against a half truth on one side, he may use words which may lead his hearers into a half truth on the other side. He may also forget that forms of speech which are not scientifically accurate may sometimes express as much truth as is needed for practical and political, sometimes even for historical purposes. In pointing out that such more popular ways of speaking are not scientifically accurate, he may fail to make allowance for the position and objects of those who use them for such more popular purposes. It may thus happen that, in making a perfectly needful protest against a popular misconception, he may use words which may lead the way to a popular misconception in the other direction. A good many of the ups and downs of opinion have run this course. A truth is stated; it is misconceived or exaggerated; a correction is made; the correction is itself misconceived and exaggerated the other way; and so the thing may go on—if only people go on caring enough about the subject—swaying backwards and forwards for ever.

We have been led into this line of thought by certain disputes which have been lately going on in various quarters about the relations of race and language. The prominence which the doctrine of race has lately held, not only in scientific and historical, but even in political discussions, is one of the characteristic marks of our time. It would have been hard a hundred years ago to per-

suaude a Russian that a Servian had any claim on him on the score of ethnological kindred. He would have been quite ready to admit the claim on the score of a common religion; but kindred speech and supposed kindred blood did not then greatly move men, unless the kindred was so close as to make them actually fellow-countrymen. A hundred years back Panorthodoxy, so to speak, was perfectly possible; Pan Slavism would have been hardly intelligible. Now things are changed; the doctrine of race plays a great part in political affairs. That it does so is a fact; and, being a fact, it is not safe to pooh-poo it. The doctrine may be foolish or mischievous; when pushed to extremes, it doubtless is foolish and mischievous; but it exists; it has an influence on men's thoughts and actions; to dismiss it as of no importance because it is thought to be foolish or mischievous would not be a practical way of looking at things. We have often pointed out that the long-continued belief in the Empire, after the Empire had in some sort become a shadow, made it in another way something more than a shadow. The Empire might be an unpractical thing; but the belief in it was a very practical thing as long as it swayed men's thoughts, and, through their thoughts, guided their actions. So the doctrine of race may be one which ought to be kept out of public affairs; but while, as a matter of fact, it has its place in public affairs, while it is a political power, and influences the course of things one way or another, it cannot be safely treated as if it had no being. It may be professed foolishly and ignorantly; it may even be professed designingly and insincerely; but, as long as those who profess it find men to listen to them and to carry out their doctrine into action, it must be accepted as a practical element in actual human affairs.

Now, when the doctrine of race is once preached, it follows almost unavoidably that the mass of mankind should seize upon language as the test for determining race. Language is the outward, obvious, striking badge of nationality, a badge which is intelligible to every one. Still to identify language and nationality, and to identify nationality with race in the strictest sense, is merely a rough-and-ready way of talking. It will often do for practical purposes, but it will not stand scientific examination. Like most other popular notions, it is a half truth; it has truth in it, but not the whole truth. It is truth, but truth looked at without due regard to other truths. Here the scientific man steps in to correct the error. We have before us the second edition of Mr. Sayce's *Principles of Comparative Philology*. At the beginning of the fifth chapter is a remarkable passage which we have lately seen once or twice quoted with regard to these matters. It stands thus:—

The fallacy of imagining that language is a sure index of race still crops up occasionally, especially in second and third-hand writers who undertake to acquaint the general public with the results of comparative philology. We still not unfrequently hear that we have to claim kindred with the dark Hindu of Southern India, not on the ground of a common tongue, but of a common descent. A very little consideration is sufficient to dispel the illusion.

Mr. Sayce then goes on to show that many of the present Hindoos must be mere aborigines, who have adopted a Sanscrit tongue, just as some Englishmen—Cornishmen, for instance—are men of another race who have adopted the English tongue. And so Mr. Sayce goes on to show, in his own words, "how little we can argue from language to race." From Mr. Sayce's scientific point of view there is nothing whatever to be said against all this. Every word of it is strictly and literally true. Language is no guide whatever to race, if by race is meant that kind of purity of blood which a lawyer would demand if a man were trying to make out his title to an estate or a peerage. For such a purpose he must make out every stage of his pedigree beyond doubt. National purity of blood of this kind is nowhere to be found; the thing is impossible. No people on earth ever kept themselves altogether from admixture with other people. If physical or legal purity of blood is needed to establish kindred of race, the task may be given up at once. On this showing, every folk is a *Mischelkolk*. Very few men are absolutely certain who their forefathers were a thousand years back; no man is absolutely certain who his forefathers were two thousand years back. It is perfectly true that many particular men, and even large classes of men, do not, in the way of physical and legal pedigree, belong to the races to which the mere test of language would assign them. Mr. Sayce's two illustrations which we have quoted, others which he goes on to quote, and many others that he might have quoted, are all perfectly to the point for his purely scientific purpose. To take the case which we ourselves started, a Russian deems himself bound to help a Bulgarian on the ground of common Slavonic descent, inferred from common Slavonic speech. It may so happen that this and that Bulgarian may be by descent Bulgarians in the strictest sense, that is, not Slaves at all, but Fins. So this or that particular Russian may come of the blood of Rurik's Warangians. He may even, if he comes from some parts of Russia, be of kin to the Finnish Bulgarians by being a Slavonized Fin himself. To all such cases Mr. Sayce's rule applies in its fullness; and if anybody has been foolish enough to say that language is an infallible test, or any test at all, of race, in Mr. Sayce's sense of race, Mr. Sayce has undoubtedly smitten him hip and thigh. The language which a particular man speaks now, the language which the inhabitants of whole districts speak now, is undoubtedly no sure test of the blood of their forefathers a thousand years back. So far language is no test of race; yet it is quite possible that, in another sense—a sense less strictly scientific, but yet practically useful—language may be a test of race. At all

events, if not a test, it may be that kind of presumption on which men commonly act in practical affairs.

What, then, do we mean by a nation? what do we mean by a race—a word that is commonly taken to mean something wider than a nation? What a nation is, like what a king is, is much easier to understand than to define. But it is quite certain that in our idea of a nation the ideas of common blood and common speech do come in, though certainly not in a strictly scientific shape. Speaking roughly, we expect a nation to consist of men of the same language under the same political government. There must be very few nations indeed which would really answer this definition. Still there is truth in the definition. So far as any particular nation agrees with this definition, we accept it as the normal state of things which we look for, and we ask no questions about it. So far as the actual state of things departs from this definition, we mark the fact, and we ask why it is so. Take our own nation, for example. It answers the definition, and does not answer it, just as well as any other. The foreigner comes into England, and, within the bounds of what he reasonably and practically counts as England, he finds certain people who speak another language. He notes the fact as exceptional, and we can tell him the special reason. So we find beyond the ocean another great English-speaking nation. We ask the reason, and we find it to be that they are a part of the English nation, which through political causes has split off and ceased to be English in a political sense. So in Germany, France, any other country, when in any district we find some other language than German or French spoken, we note the exceptional fact, and we ask the special cause. When again, as in the case of Switzerland, we find a people who are politically one nation, but where the diversity of language is so great, where the minority is so large, that we cannot call it exceptional, we mark the fact as something different from our experience of England, Germany, or France. We ask and we learn the special historical cause. And, on the other hand, when, as in the case of Poland, we find a nation, as a nation is defined by speech, cut up between three several governments, we again note the exceptional fact, and we ask and learn the special historical cause. In all these ways the number of cases which do not conform to the rule will far outnumber those that do; and yet we instinctively feel that the rule is the rule and that the other cases are the exception.

Language then is distinctly an element in the idea of a nation; indeed it is something more than an element; it is that which, in the absence of any causes working the other way, determines the nation. And, if it determines the nation, it must, in the same way and to the same extent, determine the race to which the nation forms a part. Mr. Sayce's objection is perfectly true; and yet, for practical, historical, political purposes, language is a test of race. Where is the difference? It pretty well comes to this. The practical, historical, political view, consistently for its own purposes, admits the doctrine of the Roman law which sets legal adoption on a level with natural generation. The purely scientific view, no less consistently for its own purposes, knows nothing of adoption, and will admit nothing but true physical descent. The race is like a Roman *gens*. Of the true nature of the *gens* we have often spoken before. It is a mistake to fancy that all the members of the *gens* were really kinsmen by blood. It is no less a mistake to fancy that the *gens* was a mere artificial association which had nothing to do with kindred by blood. The *gens* was a natural family, enlarged by members who belonged to it by a legal fiction, and not by natural generation. When Scipio adopted *Æmilius*, *Æmilius* became a *Cornelius* for every purpose of Roman law and Roman history. But if a philosopher had made a scientific examination of the *gens Cornelii*, to prove something about atavism or hereditary genius, he would have had to bid such artificial *Cornelii* to stand aside. So with the greater *gens* which we call a race. The Finnish Bulgarians became Slaves by adoption; the Albanians of Hydra became Greeks by adoption; crowds both of willing renegades and of kidnapped children became Turks by adoption. For all practical, historical, and political purposes these various converts, so to speak, must be counted as belonging to the races into which they were adopted. They practically passed into the new race as soon as they had fully learned to speak its language and to share its feelings. But the scientific student may fairly remind us, from his point of view, that this artificial adoption was not a physical change. He may remind us that the race into which they were adopted was, no doubt, influenced physically, and even morally, by the physical and moral qualities of its adopted members. Both views, rightly understood, are perfectly true; they are in no way contradictory to one another; and they may perfectly well go on, each for its own purpose, side by side. If the man whose purposes make him deal with the merely practical aspect of a race or a nation, uses language which implies that there is an absolute physical kindred among all its members—which implies, to use a Roman illustration, that every Julius was a natural descendant of the primordial Julius—the scientific man may fairly pull him up from his manifest error. But if the scientific man uses language, perfectly true to himself and for his own purposes, but which may be taken as implying that language is no test of race at all, that language and race have nothing to do with one another, he causes his good to be evil spoken of. In confuting one error, he may not unlikely lead men into another.

GENTLEMAN HELPS.

WHEN Thackeray invented, in *The Fitz Boobles Papers*, some new professions for younger sons, he did not think of suggesting competition with Jeames. That gentlemen should become servants is the latest idea of the shiftless persons who can never find any work for their hands to do, and who are constantly appealing to the tender mercies of society. A "Poor Gentleman" states his sad experience in the *Times*, and makes a pitiful proposal which is characteristic of his class. He is "by birth and education a gentleman"; he is thirty years old; and, "owing to recent losses, earnestly seeks work." There is something very pathetic in the notion of a born gentleman being compelled by losses to seek occupation. Had it not been for cruel fortune, he might have lived through all the length of all his years as idly as in his first thirty. Fate has decided otherwise; and we gain some insight into the "education of a gentleman" when we learn that only two sorts of career are open to this luckless one. He scorns "a miserable City clerkship at 50*l.* or 60*l.* per annum." He, "and many like him," he says, "would gladly serve some nobleman or gentleman as game and forest-keeper, or even as coachman or head gardener."

The "Poor Gentleman," and people of his sort, seem unable to guess how mean a figure they make when they express their anxiety to wear a coachman's wig or a keeper's velveteens. What manner of education can that have been which has left them with a clerk's knowledge of reading and writing at the best? What sort of spirit is that which prefers the lot of a menial, pampered or otherwise, to the rough freedom of a miner in South Africa or Australia, or even of a shepherd in the Pampas? At the least, a gentleman, if he has the health and strength and courage which a gamekeeper requires, in addition to the habit of command, might aspire to be an overseer in a sheep station or a gang-master in Chili or Peru. The world should be his oyster at the age of thirty, and he needs little but the muscles and heart that nature has given him to find an opening somewhere between Alaska and Borneo. He and his like prefer "the large salaries," and probably the tips, "obtained by head gardeners, gamekeepers, huntsmen, &c.," "coupled with employment more congenial to their taste than a three-legged stool in some City counting-house." A three-legged stool is certainly an odd, and not perhaps a lucrative, employment; but there are alternatives, and, to use the same style of writing, a stock-whip or a pickaxe might be more congenial employment to a gentleman with a taste for freedom.

Setting aside the poverty of spirit shown in this kind of appeal, there is apparent that incurable ignorance and blindness to the facts of life which make it quite impossible to help people unable to help themselves. The person who wrote to the *Times* had received no education but that useful one "of a gentleman," and had apparently lived in indolence. Yet he seems to think that he could at once take a high, indeed the highest, place in any one of three sorts of skilled labour. Shooting is a pleasant amusement, and the life of a head keeper seems therefore to be an easy one. The gentleman who sighs for the place probably thinks the keeper does nothing but potter about with a gun over his shoulder and a dog at his heels, during the greater part of the year. In August, or October, he places gentlemen in warm corners, or sends them on the best beat, or manages that they shall have the surest chance of a shot at a stag, being guided by their rank in the peerage, and by his expectation of tips. These feats may be congenial to the taste of some persons of birth and education, but they do not make the whole duties of a keeper. To rise early and go to bed late, to manage in the best and most economical way a fairly complicated organization, to know woodcraft as men only know it who have studied it from their boyhood, all this and much more that implies toil and pains makes the duty of a keeper. We do not mean to say that no gentleman could win golden opinions in a gamekeeper's place, for many seem to have been intended by nature for this very occupation. But, if they have energy enough to be good servants, they are also capable of something better, and do in fact use their ability in some more honourable way. It is only in the way of by-work that gentlemen show that they might have been watermen, or keepers, or professional cricketers.

Aburd as is the notion of an amateur turning head gamekeeper at thirty, the ambition to be a head gardener is even more childish. Head gardeners are a class of beings whom it is impossible to contemplate without awe and humility. They are so wonderfully intelligent that they may be excused if they share the foible attributed to Mr. Craig by Mrs. Poyser—"He's welly like a cock as think's the sun's rose o' purpose to hear him crow." Head gardeners need a minute knowledge of all sorts of facts about climate, soils, manures, even chemistry, which is not to be gained without the watchful experience of half a lifetime. They are men of culture too, and write learned books on Virgil's treatment of the vine, and on modern improvements on the method recommended in the *Georgics*. They have long Latin and Greek names at the tips of their tongues, and pronounce them with a rapidity and in a manner rather baffling and bewildering to the mere scholar. It is not easy to find any occupation suited to a gentleman who fancies that he can blossom in a moment into a head gardener. As for the other object of our "Poor Gentleman's" aspirations, it would be easy to show that a head coachman has duties more complicated than the mere administration of antimony to the steeds in his charge. How does a "Poor Gentleman" propose to acquire in an hour that respectful sourness which will frighten a

lady out of her wish to "take out his horses"? This gift comes not without thought and study, and probably a head coachman has other accomplishments into which it would be profane to pry too closely. There is really no analogy between these occupations and that of henchman and general overseer which used to be held by poor relations or dependents. Will Wimble would have declined to wear Sir Roger's livery, and Di Vernon's brothers, grooms and keepers as they were by nature, turned over Gwilym, at least on winter nights, and knew that a gentleman cannot sink to the rank of a servant without self-contempt. It may be said that the markets are more crowded now than many gentlemen have "gone into trade" without a shudder; and why should not others go into service? The distinction is pretty clear, especially at a time when the classes who used to fill menial positions seem, whether wisely or not, to prefer a sort of work which leaves them more independence.

When reforms of this venturesome sort are being discussed, the world naturally expects some remarks from Mrs. Crawshaw. We regret to find that this lady, who should understand the intricacies of the question, is in favour of "gentlemen helps" for out-of-door work. In a letter to the *Times* she "feels sure that the arrangement would be fraught with comfort to employer and to employed, while to her lady helps (located, we will presume, with the same family) how charming to have a relative in 'the pretty cottage down the lane,' or occupying the gardener's house." We scarcely feel equal to the task of dilating on this picture of rural felicity. The daughters of literary men, and of colonels in the army, also of admirals, among whom Mrs. Crawshaw finds eager recruits, must up to this moment, when one comes to think of it, have sighed in vain for the society of gentlemen. Weary of polishing the brass door-handles which "in Wales" (we quote Mrs. Crawshaw's tract "On Domestic Service") "are great objects of pride," and sated even "with the immense comfort found in Leon's patent gas stove," the fancy of the lady helps may have lightly turned to thoughts of love. Yet what Mrs. Crawshaw beautifully calls "the *empressment* of the lady help" would have been wasted on a mere ordinary keeper, or gardener. How much more genial when a relation—perhaps a cousin; the son, no doubt, of an admiral—is "located" in a pretty rose-hung cottage down the lane. One hears, as it were, in fancy, the whispering of plighted lady and gentleman help, in the silvery moonlight, beneath the chestnut shade. One looks forward to a little rural idyl of a new and genteel sort, which would never have been possible without Leon's patent stove and the admirable new dodge whereby "the blackening of her own boots by a lady has been made easy. . . . so that no one need soil so much as even one finger in the process." We trust that a new fashion of genteel traps for vermin may be devised, so that the gentleman keeper may preserve the dainty whiteness of his fashionable fingers.

People who believe in the possible success of the system of "lady helps" must be sorry to see this new addition to it. A lady who has the misfortune to be poor ought at least, if she has any sense at all, to know something about the management of a household, and should be able to perform the lighter duties of a servant. Educated as most women unluckily are, she may very likely find it impossible to get any more congenial employment than that of a "lady help." If she does not mind making herself the subject of an experiment, she may try that career. But it is quite a different thing when we find men covetous of a keeper's hire and a keeper's gratuities. In the first place, they certainly do not, as a rule, possess an adequate knowledge of their duties. The gentleman, however dull, who is fitted to be a gamekeeper has a fund of energy and health which would do him good service in Canada or in the Bush. He, at least, has no need to take the money of a master in his own rank of life. The man who is ready to do that is likely to be a *dilettante* in sport, as in everything else. He has probably passed his time in shirking work and choosing amusement, and when necessity presses him he thinks he can turn his pleasure into a profession. It is scarcely necessary to warn any one against engaging this class of keeper or groom. Men do not want to make experiments where their sports are concerned. They know very well the measure of the worth of the indolent people who are always looking for a patent place. They can foresee that they will be sulky and lazy servants, just as they were indolent clerks, or the waifs and strays whom the most lenient examiners have not been able to pass. Perhaps it is the envy of inherited wealth and luxury that makes the world so full of helpless hangers-on, handless and brainless. In the case of women it is natural to pity a shiftlessness which is not all their own fault. But no one need waste pity on the "poor gentleman" who has had a gentleman's education, and possesses good health and sound limbs. The world is full of openings for such people, if they have any worth at all, especially if they really are so far from being dainty that they even are willing to imitate the early English who "bowed their necks in the evil days for bread."

MR. LOWE ON UNIVERSITIES.

MR. LOWE has contributed to the February number of the *Fortnightly Review* a paper under the title "Shall we Create a New University?" It is, in fact, devoted, formally, to discussing and rejecting the claims of Owens College, Manchester, to a Royal Charter; practically, in great measure, to disparaging, in his usual style of sweeping invective, the ancient Universities

of Oxford and Cambridge. It will presently appear that our measure of disagreement with Mr. Lowe is wider and deeper than our measure of agreement; and we are therefore happy to be able to begin by saying that we agree with his practical conclusion, though not with the grounds on which it is based. So much, indeed, our readers will hardly require to be told, inasmuch as we examined the question ourselves some months ago (see *Saturday Review*, August 12, 1876), and gave our reasons as well for more than doubting the general expediency of multiplying Universities as for very specially disputing the fitness of Manchester to become the site for a new one, even if such a foundation were thought desirable. And to those reasons we adhere, although, as Mr. Lowe informs us, of twenty-five answers to the circular issued by the Professors of Owens College, sixteen are "distinctly favourable" to their demand, while the remaining nine express doubt or absolute dissent. Mr. Lowe is probably right in pointing out that—apart from all disputes as to the historical origin or etymology of the term university—the main object of this demand on the part of Owens College is to obtain a royal grant or the power of conferring degrees, which they think "will be an excellent puff for the institution." We are with him in not desiring to see this privilege extended to Manchester, but not at all with him in deprecating it as virtually worthless, or worse than worthless, in itself through its "degradation" at Oxford and Cambridge, where he broadly hints that B.A.'s are "*baculo potius quam laurea digni*," and M.A.'s "*magistri artium sine artibus*." The fundamental mistake, according to his view, lies in conferring on "students" degrees which ought to be restricted to "teachers," while "honours" have been allowed to usurp the intellectual prestige which ought to be inseparable from the degree itself. This appears also to be Mr. Freeman's view in the passage we quoted before, where he advises Manchester, after obtaining its Charter, not to "keep your place at fever heat with endless examinations and class tests, but let the degree itself be respectable." Mr. Lowe goes so far as to suggest that Oxford and Cambridge have "scandalously" lowered the standard of degrees from sordid motives, to increase their numbers and emoluments, and even commits himself to the astounding paradox that "two Royal Commissions have swept over the Universities, but have produced no improvement." By no "improvement" is evidently meant no raising of the average standard of work required of passmen; and it is hardly necessary to observe that the most moderate acquaintance with the condition of Oxford—we speak of Oxford simply because it is the University with which we happen to be most familiar—as it is now and as it was some twenty years ago would suffice to refute this marvellous indictment. It would be equally untrue to say, in view of Keble College and the "unattached" students, what is implied in Mr. Lowe's argument, and still more explicitly in Sir Benjamin Brodie's urgent plea for the chartering of Manchester, which we quoted before, that the necessary expenses of a University education remain what they were. Whether the Royal Commissions have "produced no improvement" or the reverse, on which of course people are free to hold their own opinion, there can at least be no sort of doubt that in both these respects they have produced a material change.

But the essence of Mr. Lowe's contention is that, whereas "the real business of the University is with the great mass of its students," their interests are utterly neglected. On the first point we once more have the pleasure of agreeing with him, though writers like Mr. Mark Pattison and other zealous advocates of the "Endowment of Research" seem strangely apt to forget it. But our difference with him on the second point cuts to the root of the matter. It is no doubt true in one sense, though his way of stating it is somewhat invidious, that "young men are sent to Oxford and Cambridge for many other reasons besides the acquisition of knowledge of any kind. The good-will of these ancient and venerable establishments, using the word in its legal sense, is enormous." We demur to the words we have italicized, and we think the following clause, rightly understood, goes far to modify, if not to refute them. Young men are certainly often sent to college for other reasons besides the pursuit of what is sometimes disparagingly called "book knowledge," though it would be very difficult for them, begging Mr. Lowe's pardon, to gain a degree under the existing system, without being obliged to acquire a certain amount of that unwelcome commodity. But we differ from him *toto calo* when he says he is "not aware that there is any 'training' peculiar to Universities," unless it be the teaching and training for honours. What is the meaning of the "good-will" to which he had before referred? It surely means something more than that three years' residence at the University supplies a title for orders, or an opportunity for making good acquaintances, or the means of relieving parents of a troublesome charge, or a pledge of respectability, which is all that he seems disposed to admit. Granting for argument's sake that Oxford and Cambridge have all the defects he imputes to them—which would be easily and speedily enough transferred to any new University that might be started—what we pointed out on a former occasion remains equally true, that "the excellences of Oxford and Cambridge are peculiar and incommunicable, and are not to be reproduced straight off at Manchester or Leeds." Mr. Lowe's argument, if it proved anything, would prove a great deal too much. Many boys are sent to our public schools for other purposes besides learning Latin and Greek, and gain much solid benefit from the time they spend there, even though to the last their standard of scholarship may remain "scandalously low." The common remark that in after-life you can generally tell a

public schoolman from another almost at first sight proves at least that a "peculiar training" of some kind is imparted there. And if this is true of Harrow and Eton, it is still more emphatically true of Oxford and Cambridge. It has been said that a boy who has gone straight from school into some active career will seem like "a young barbarian" to his companion who has passed through the University. That is rather a trenchant way of putting it; but the revolution effected in a man's whole mind and character by his three or four years at the University—and we are by no means speaking of classmen only—is incalculable. Mr. Lowe, who is himself an Oxford man, must have known that once, if he has forgotten it now. But then, to be sure, Oxford, in spite of recent building, is still but a small city, and its influence ought perhaps to be rated by the same numerical scale which, as he has taught us, reduces the battle of Marathon to its proper insignificance. There are some people who live to unlearn.

It is pleasant to find, amid these grave points of difference, that on one very important question Mr. Lowe, if we rightly understand him, is entirely on our side. We mean as to the true nature and scope of University education. Whether the phrase "University teaching," etymologically considered, "has some reference to universality" in the subject-matter taught, may perhaps be open to question. Dr. Newman tells us in the preface to his *Discourses on University Education* that "the view here taken of a University is, that it is a place of *teaching universal knowledge*." But this is not apparently intended exactly as an explanation of the name; for elsewhere, in replying to the question "What is a University?" though he refers to its ancient name of "*Studium Generale*, or School of Universal Learning," he adds that "this description implies the assemblage of strangers from all parts in one place," and that "in its simple and rudimental form it is a school of knowledge of every kind, *consisting of teachers and learners from every quarter*." There would indeed be a difficulty in showing that universality of knowledge was part of the original idea of a University, considering that several of the mediæval Universities in Italy were founded for the teaching of one or two special branches of knowledge, such as Law or Medicine. Perhaps, however, both notions, of a universality of teachers and of teaching, are, properly speaking, included in the full definition of the term. Be that as it may, we most certainly agree with Mr. Lowe—who is so far following in the steps of Dr. Newman and other distinguished apologists of the traditional system of our Universities—when he insists on this characteristic of a general instead of a special or professional training, as essential to the true idea of University education. The obvious danger of this principle being lost sight of at Owens College constitutes an additional objection to the grant of a Charter; but the passage in which Mr. Lowe urges his objection deserves being put on record for the sake of the general principle he lays down. It is with this object chiefly that we cite it in conclusion here, the more readily because we are always glad to recognize the testimony of Saul among the prophets:—

There is naturally enough a tendency in a great manufacturing centre like Manchester to make such an institution as Owens College subservient to the industry of the place. Not in the sense which every one must approve, by giving students a thoroughly sound education, but by teaching them the very arts which they are to practise in after life. We have heard a good deal about "university teaching," a term to which we have found it difficult to attach any very satisfactory sense; but if the word has any meaning at all, that meaning has some reference to universality, and implies what is undoubtedly true, that no university, really worthy of the name, will stoop to make its teaching a school for the learning a particular trade, such as calico printing for instance, or put Pegasus in harness to draw the wheel of a cotton mill. It is quite possible in education to be too special as well as too general, and in the teaching of youth the former is a far worse fault than the latter.

ATLANTIC TRAFFIC.

WHEN nations of kindred race and energy inhabiting different hemispheres are merely divided by an ocean, it is marvellous how easily they bridge it. An interesting article on Atlantic traffic which appeared the other day in the *Times* supplies us with some useful information and suggests some curious speculations. It appears that at the present moment, from the port of Liverpool alone, there are ten fleets of first-class steamers sailing to New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Canadian harbours; while, besides these, there are a couple of lines from the Clyde, commissioned and supported by the enterprise of Glasgow. Nowadays a weekly Atlantic service by the steamships of a single Company is nothing extraordinary; sometimes, when the passenger business is brisk, in the height of the season, there are two despatches in the seven days. And it is morally certain, notwithstanding the existing depression of trade, which is mainly due to accidental circumstances, that there must be a steady development in the traffic which has already grown to such gigantic proportions. Since population is increasing rapidly in the Old World, the outflow to America, which has been checked for the time, will receive a renewed impulse. As trade gets lively again, our Transatlantic friends will sink more of their spare dollars in the excitement of European travel; while it may be predicted that in the future the commerce in provisions will assume an importance on the magnitude of which it would be rash to speculate. If they glance over the details given in the *Times*' article, the people of the present generation will see how much they have to be thankful for. It is not so very long ago that the crack Atlantic liners were driven by sails instead of steam; and even when steam-vessels first took up

the running, they were of something less than a third of the average burden of the present magnificent packets. Every one must remember the particulars of the passage of "the noble packet-ship the *Screw*" in which Martin Chuzzlewit and the jolly Mr. Tapley had embarked. The sufferings of the miserable victims whose poverty consigned them to the steerage were in no degree exaggerated by the imagination of the novelist. Cramped up in most confined quarters, absolutely destitute of accommodation, they were drenched perpetually by the breaking seas. Even if ordinarily prudent in the matter of provisions, they were likely to be on short commons before they stepped on the quay on the other side; and their home-sick affections must have been ardent indeed if they were ever tempted to revisit the old country, unless they could pay for first-class berths. Even the first-class passengers had their sorrows, and plenty of them; and as the term of their misery depended on the chances of the weather, it was always matter of extreme uncertainty. Nowadays the occupation of the interviewers of the *Sewer* and the *Stabber*, who boarded each vessel on its arrival to make a raid on the captain's champagne, is become a thing of the past. Each of the rival fleets has its well-established reputation; and if there is any shortcoming in the way of punctuality, it is set down at once to *force majeure*; in reality, to borrow the impassioned language of Colonel Diver, a vessel's "passage either way is almost certain to eventuate a spanker." We do not say that even now well-founded complaints are unheard of. Of course, in spite of emigration surveyors and codes of regulation, there will be speculators who will run the chance of fines and take shiploads of live lumber, on terms that can only pay by inflicting a maximum of hardship. But, if emigrants make application in the proper quarters, they may assure a speedy delivery at their destination, with a gratifying combination of cheapness and comfort. It marks the movement and enterprise of the present time when we hear of steamers with crews of 150 hands capable of carrying 1,700 passengers. As for gentlemen bound on pleasure or business with whom money is no particular object, they have only to make their choice, and can give free scope to their fastidiousness. They live in splendidly furnished suites of apartments arranged tier over tier, as large, if not quite as lofty, as the rooms in fashionable hotels. They sleep in airy and spacious cabins. They sit down at sumptuously served tables, and are waited upon by troops of well-drilled attendants; and, if they suffer from sea-sickness or more serious maladies, they have the advantage of skilful medical attendance. They enjoy an equable temperature in winter, with abundance of ice in summer; and there are baths, and smoking-rooms, and all the rest of it, with amusements suitable to shipboard, and a choice of lively company.

Of course this increased competition and the accelerated pace have their darker side. That serious accidents have come so seldom says much for the skill with which the fleets are navigated; and some of the Companies can boast with justice that they have never lost a single ship. All the same, the passage is necessarily a dangerous one at certain seasons. The Atlantic in a hurricane is no joke, even to a well-found vessel of heavy tonnage with powerful engines and ample sea-room. A mishap to the steamer's machinery may leave her at the mercy of tremendous rollers, or at best she may be driven out of the ordinary track, and have to beat up for her port crippled under canvas. There are the perils from the dense fogs so prevalent in those latitudes, and which gather so thickly off the coasts of the British possessions, and about the mouth of the St. Lawrence. Even when speed is slackened, there may easily be a collision; for all vessels do not keep their lights burning or careful look-outs, and the thoroughfare followed by the steamers is dangerously crowded. Nor does even extreme watchfulness always avail to save you from striking suddenly on an iceberg; and it is unhappily by no means an unknown occurrence to make a mistake of many miles in the reckoning, and steam full on to some rock-bound headland, when you imagine you are giving it an ample berth. Every now and then one hears of such a disaster; while at long intervals a steamer is reported missing, when there comes no "message from the sea" to explain the cause of her disappearance. Absolute immunity from danger is practically unattainable. It is true that the practice of actual racing from port to port between the champion vessels of opposition Companies has been wisely discouraged. The press unanimously denounced the danger of it, since the responsibility of some tremendous disaster became too serious to be lightly courted. But it is difficult to put down racing in an indirect shape now that men are in the habit of living so fast, and since Englishmen and Americans, of all people in the world, are the most shortsightedly sensitive to the value of time. Steam Companies contract for carrying the mails under heavy penalties for want of punctuality; business despatches and perishable freights demand prompt delivery; and vessels that earned a character for safety and slowness would be left nowhere in the competition for passengers and cargoes. In considering the inevitable conditions of the traffic, we have only to congratulate ourselves that the seamanship of the Atlantic marine has kept pace with improvements in shipbuilding and with the spirit and enterprise of the shipowners. The captains and officers are "bound to be smart," but their smartness is tempered by skill and vigilance.

So far as freights are concerned, the later reports of the carrying trade have been by no means satisfactory. Some of our staple exports to America show a notable falling off, with very faint probabilities of a speedy resumption of activity. It is not only that high protective tariffs operate against our English

shippers. But the United States are in a fair way of supplying themselves with the raw materials for many important branches of industry which they have been in the habit of importing from England. Recent investigations have developed vast indigenous wealth in copper and iron; so much so that, in the opinion of M. Simonin, the day may not be far distant when the Americans will be sending us iron. At present our ships, when they do not go over in ballast, have to load with salt, which scarcely pays them better. But, if exports from England must apparently continue to decline, it is evident that our imports will go on increasing. What used to be called the Western States, although really in the centre of the Union, have been turning an unlimited extent of prairie into corn land; while the grand staple of California has become grain in place of gold. The unfenced farms of the Sacramento country, in their size and prolific luxuriance, stand in a similar relation to those of the Lothians as the "big trees" of the Yosemite Valley to the oaks of our English parks. Already the Americans are fast driving the Russians out of the English corn-trade. The proportions in which the two nations used to supply us have been much more than reversed in the last few years, and the enterprise and science of our Transatlantic neighbours have been stimulated to improve their natural advantages. They propose to go to work in earnest in the mouths of the Mississippi to clear those natural obstacles which have hitherto obstructed communication. We may count on an important reduction in freights, and a proportionate impulse to the traffic, when cargoes despatched from St. Louis, or possibly even from the elevators of Chicago, can be sent to the Thames or the Mersey without transhipment. According to present appearances, too, we may hope one day to see the reform of our butchers' bills as a consequence of the importation of American beef. Should the owners of the countless herds that roam over the Texan grazing-grounds find it a paying speculation to breed for the English consumer, they will create a new branch of the shipping business. Altogether, we may believe that the Atlantic traffic, wonderful as its recent development has been, is only in its youth, if not in its infancy; and we see reason to hope that in the immediate future it may very materially diminish the necessary expenses of living.

HOSPITALITIES TO THE PRESS.

FOR some time past there has been appearing in some of the newspapers a series of highly effusive articles, singing the praises of a certain sea-side resort on the coast of Kent. Here, at last, if we might believe these accounts, Elysium had been found. The scenery, the air, the accommodation for visitors, were described as of the most perfect kind; and we could not help wondering how it was that this place, which had been in existence in a quiet way for several years, had suddenly, like Byron, gone to bed and awoke famous. A slip of candour, however, on the part of some of those who have been vaunting the merits of this recently discovered paradise lets us into the secret. In the *Globe* of Monday evening there was an article stating that "a party, composed chiefly of representatives of the metropolitan press," paid a visit to this happy spot, "at the invitation of the new proprietor of the hotel there." The reason of this visit, we further learn, was that the new proprietor "was desirous of obtaining an independent opinion from good judges as to its present working condition, and the possibility of adapting it to public requirements." So these good-natured "representatives of the press" resolved to go down, and give him their independent opinion and advice. This particular Correspondent seems to have been thrown into an ecstasy of delight by all he saw. "The system of baths is one," he says, "of the most comprehensive and varied that we have ever seen in a single building"—the suggestion being, we suppose, that he has seen many of the finest things in that way in the world, but never anywhere with all their various perfections so concentrated as here. Then, "as a residential hotel during the winter," this hotel "is second to none, and it ought to have special attractions for returned Anglo-Indians and others, whose impaired health requires some recruiting before being subjected to the strain of London life." This is very neatly put; but, from what we have observed in regard to Anglo-Indians, we should doubt whether in the winter-time they would altogether relish a windy situation on the top of a cliff. But then, "during the hot"—perhaps wet is meant—"weather the banqueting hall and chamber are given up to visitors for promenading, or indoor games, such as Badminton, La Crosse, and Pawne"—all quiet games, the melodious sound of which is soothing to invalid nerves—"while there are also billiard-rooms, an American bowling-alley"—well padded we hope—and indoor and outdoor rinks. Here, then, we have not only "one of the healthiest marine resorts in England," but, "what with the society in the hotel, the amusements there provided, and the near vicinity of lively"—here a neighbouring watering-place is mentioned—"a person would have to be either very exacting or exceptionally dull if the time passed slowly." The proprietor of the hotel will, no doubt, be glad to have this "independent opinion from a good judge," who is kind enough to say he thinks the place perfect as it is, and quite incapable of improvement in any way. Indeed the only suggestion he makes is the "improvement of its means of communication with London"; and, by a curious coincidence, it appears that this has already been provided by the foresight and liberality of the new proprietor.

We get some more light on the subject from a writer in the *Morning Post*. That journal is understood to be the favourite organ of fashionable life, and it therefore speaks well for the aristocratic prospects of this speculation, that "those who had an opportunity of inspecting the hotel on Saturday were struck by the admirable order in which everything is kept, and by the air of comfort which stamps the establishment." "The dining-hall is one of the finest and most beautifully decorated rooms of the kind in England or on the Continent; indeed, for splendour of adornment, it is unmatched. Its stained glass windows, carved stone mantelpiece, and arabesque decorations leave a very pleasant impression on the eyes, which light upon something agreeable in every direction." "Only second in importance to this apartment is the ladies' drawing-room, which is charmingly arranged"—but why did the writer miss another pretty touch, "and charmingly filled"? "The reading-room is exceedingly comfortable, and with a large theatre in the house, and a rink on the premises, it is difficult to imagine what besides the hotel visitor can desire." Yet something, if possible more delightful, remains behind. "The feature of the hotel is unquestionably its series of baths." "Nowhere in England can a series of baths such as that here be seen." Moreover "the hotel stands in an admirable position on the edge of the cliff, and of course commands a beautiful view of the sea." And not content with this ecstatic present, the writer opens up the future:—"Very shortly the road now being made will be opened from the beach to the hotel, and the exterior of the building will be made bright with flowers and plants."

We were rather surprised to find that in these glowing accounts of this magnificent mansion nothing was said about one important feature in such establishments—the living. The *Globe* man does not allude in the faintest way to any meal, being, no doubt, too much entranced by the ideal perfections of the place to stoop to such vulgar details. And his colleague of the *Post*, in filling up his magniloquent description of the dining-hall, perhaps had no fine words left to give an idea of the dinner. It is mentioned casually, however, in the beginning of the article that "the enterprising proprietor of this hotel entertained upwards of sixty guests on Saturday, and, previous to dinner, caused them to be shown the interior working of the hotel and its vast capacity for accommodating visitors." Putting the two accounts together, it appears that it was the "representatives of the metropolitan press" who formed the chief element in the company who were thus handsomely entertained, and that the "enterprising proprietor" judged wisely in inviting inspection of his premises by "good judges" who were able to disseminate their "independent opinions" in the daily papers in return for their entertainment and free railway passes. Possibly the reference to the pleasant society at the hotel is intended to suggest that a certain number of "representatives of the metropolitan press" will always be found there, with the run of the house. It may perhaps seem to some people that this generous hospitality to the press is a small thing; but we are afraid that it indicates that a certain class of our contemporaries have a weakness in this respect which may possibly extend in other directions.

TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR ARMY RECRUITS.

ENGLAND is the only great Power in Europe that endeavours to keep up a sufficient military force without having recourse to compulsory service. Her insular position enables her to provide for her defence with an army far less numerous than those of Continental Powers, and allows her to put off until the eve of hostilities her ultimate preparation for war. But year by year the difficulty of providing a sufficiency of soldiers becomes more serious; and although a partial stagnation of trade or some other check to the prosperity of the country may produce a temporary influx of men into the ranks, the strain on the departments to which the task of recruiting for the army belongs is constantly increasing, and threatens ere long to necessitate some modified form of compulsory service. Until every expedient has been tried to meet the difficulty, no Ministry, except under the pressure of immediate rational danger, would venture to propose conscription; the interference with the habits of the people, and the restrictions that it would place on personal liberty, would render the adoption of such a system so unpopular that any scheme which would ward it off deserves to be carefully considered, and, if necessary, tested, before the example of the Continental nations could be imitated in this country.

Among other proposals for providing an annual and comparatively certain supply of recruits, the plan by which boys are educated and trained for the navy and the mercantile marine has been held up as one that might be imitated in the army. The sources of supply would be the Industrial Schools, the Workhouses, and possibly the Reformatories, although some objections might be urged against the last-mentioned source. From these establishments boys are already obtained in considerable numbers as musicians, drummers, and workmen in the regimental shops—i.e. for the limited supply of boys who are permitted to be taken on the strength of regiments. The result has been found satisfactory, the systematic training afforded in the schools being no bad preparation for military life. But when the question arises of providing the army with soldiers capable of bearing arms, the difficulty of meeting the expense of educating and supporting lads at the age when they would usually quit school, and before they would be fit to enter

the ranks, is one which those who are responsible for the Army Estimates are naturally unwilling to face. It would result in a kind of State education for boys who would be capable in civil life of partially providing for themselves, and consequently the advantages that would arise from this source of supply, and the probable saving of expense in other departments of the service, remain to be proved by those who advocate the scheme.

Perhaps the most exhaustive arguments in its favour are those that were elicited by a paper read by Mr. Macgregor at the United Service Institution, when the subject was fully discussed, and many valuable opinions were called forth. It was urged that, if encouragement were given, a very large number of boys would be ready to volunteer for service in the army, five thousand annually being mentioned as a probable estimate. The formation of training establishments connected with the army was advocated, where discipline would be inculcated, and, in addition to drill, trades would be taught—such as tailoring, shoemaking, and the artificers' work required from pioneers. Some objection was made to calling these establishments schools, lest the boys, who might at fifteen or fifteen and a half be dismissed from the industrial or parish schools, should be unwilling to subject themselves to what they might conceive to be a similar system of discipline. It was proposed that the organization should be a military one, and that the lads should either be collected in suitable and separate buildings, or be attached as companies to the depot centres, being treated, so far as might be possible, as soldiers. By this means it was hoped that, at an age suitable for entering the ranks, which might be seventeen and a half or eighteen, the young men could with very little extra drill be received as trained soldiers, ready at all events for home service. To afford security that they would enlist into the army, and so give a *quid pro quo* for their education, they would be required to engage for military service when they entered the training establishments. The alleged advantages of this scheme were that it would ensure a constant supply of men to the ranks, forming no mean proportion of the annual number required; whilst the knowledge of the physical and moral qualities of the youths by those in charge of them would enable them to detect unfitness for a military career before enlistment, and the habits of order and discipline which would prevent the feeling of irksomeness consequent on the necessary restraints to which soldiers are subject, would, it was contended, tend to diminish the percentage of desertions. As regards expense, the cost of the training establishments was to be counterbalanced by the advantage of obtaining a superior class of recruits, by a diminished outlay on the recruiting service, and by the fewer number of desertions, with the serious losses in various ways which these entail on the country. The success of a somewhat similar scheme for manning the navy and the mercantile marine was urged as practical proof of its feasibility, although it was allowed that sea service, which finds places for boys more readily than the army, affords a somewhat more suitable field of experiment.

Such is the general outline of the scheme, and to appreciate it in its various bearings, the difference between this mode of training men for the ranks and the plan of providing for the education of musicians, drummers, and other boys who are permitted to be borne on the roll of regiments, ought to be clearly kept in view. The number of the latter is of course very small, and any increase would take away from the strength of the army, as it is obvious that the substitution of boys for men would diminish its efficiency. The scheme under consideration proposes to train youths for soldiers, and to hand them over to the colonels fit for their places in the ranks. The difficulties are, first, the expense, especially if the whole number were to be included in the army estimates, and thus to provoke criticism and excite discontent. But if a portion of the cost could be fairly borne by some other department, and form part of the sum allotted to education, this difficulty might be diminished; whilst the country would benefit indirectly by the education and supervision of lads who are often discharged from school at an age when restraint is more than ever required, and who subsequently swell the numbers of the idle and dangerous classes. Another difficulty which has been put forward arises from the supposed unwillingness of parents and guardians to permit those under their charge to become soldiers, and possibly the distaste of the boys themselves for a military life. The removal of the prejudice which is felt against soldiering by the artisan and labouring classes may perhaps be a work of some little time; but as the recent changes in the army are more and more appreciated, and as the value attaching to the discipline and education of men who, enlisting for only six years, re-enter civil life in the prime of manhood, comes to be understood—which it soon will be through the situations easily obtained by good soldiers—the feeling that a boy who enlists is a son to be grieved over will gradually disappear. If in the Government and parochial schools pains are taken to put before the boys the advantages offered by a soldier's career, and at the same time to stimulate an honest ambition by military history and anecdotes, a taste for the army will gradually be developed. This taste will be promoted by the drill which is practised in most of the larger schools, especially if care is taken to make proficiency a matter of emulation under a system of inspection by properly qualified officers. In fact, as Mr. Macgregor points out, the proper persons to recruit for the army should be those who have charge of the education of the country, and those who voluntarily devote much of their time to military work. If clergymen, schoolmasters, and the Volunteer officers of the country districts could

be induced to throw their influence into the scale, the recruiting-sergeant would be little needed.

The scheme would at first be tentative; possibly some use might be made of the two educational establishments now connected with the army, the Duke of York's and the Hibernian schools, as, in consequence of the short-service system, there will soon be but few sons of soldiers who under the present regulations will be eligible for admission to them. The proposal to attach companies of boys to the depôts of the regular and militia battalions, and then to train them for the two years that would intervene before they would join the ranks, presents considerable difficulties. The boys would have to be kept apart from the troops, and the same system which would be suitable to the disciplining of soldiers would not be well adapted for lads of sixteen. In addition to duty which would only occupy a small part of the day, and to the ordinary schooling which would have to be kept up, education in trades which would afterwards be useful in the regiments would be carried out. There is a constant demand for tailors, shoemakers, and artificers to act as pioneers, and this demand might easily be supplied by the young men trained at these schools. There is also some difficulty, owing to short service, in procuring a supply of non-commissioned officers—a position to which well-trained lads, carefully educated in all that pertains to a military career, might reasonably aspire. The question whether the utility of the scheme would compensate for the cost is the main point at issue; but, seeing the difficulty of procuring recruits of a proper stamp, and the necessity of warding off forced service as long as possible, few will deny that it merits careful consideration, and, if possible, a fair trial on such a scale as would not necessitate any large outlay of money.

RICHARD III. AT THE LYCEUM.

THE production of *Richard III.* last Monday had a double interest in its being, as far as we know, the first restoration to the stage of the original text since the days of Burbage, and the occasion of Mr. Irving's appearance in a part for which his powers have always seemed eminently fitted. The advertisement of the play announces "strictly the original text, without interpolation, but simply with such omissions and transpositions as have been found essential for dramatic representation." Amongst the omissions of things that might be well restored are certain lines of Richard's in the tent scene, which may be spoken of more particularly in discussing that scene; amongst the transpositions may be included the turning Rivers, Vaughan, and Grey into "three gentlemen in one" under the name of Rivers; the ingenious, but somewhat confusing, tagging together of odds and ends of lines from other scenes to announce the King's death in the second act; and the assigning the speeches of the Second to the First Murderer; while certain speeches which have been retained might perhaps as well have been left out. But it would be ungracious to carp at a thing which has on the whole been done with most praiseworthy care and skill. We may, however, suggest that for the record of Mr. Irving's success in Dublin printed on the back of the playbills there might be substituted some account of the manner in which the play has been arranged for the stage, or even a slight historical sketch of the period.

The attention of the spectator is naturally centred on Richard, although it must be said that the general performance of the other characters is to be commended; and it may be well first to give some general impression of Mr. Irving's performance. There is an interesting paper in the *Dramatic Magazine* for August 1830 on the "Genius and Acting of Kean," in which occurs this passage:—"We now proceed to Mr. Kean's Richard. . . which, though bitterly satirical, crafty, and heroic, is neither the Richard of Shakspeare, Cibber, or the Richard of history; for Gloster, instead of being morose, snarling, and dissatisfied, as Kean represents him, abounded in vivacity and humour. . . He can smile and murder while he smiles, not so much hypocritically as from the pure love of the sport; indeed, he cannot murder without a smile, as he cuts a joke upon all his deeds of blood; and such is the sprightliness of his disposition that even his own deformity, the contemplation of which is the only thing capable of disturbing the self-complacency of his thoughts, often excites merriment. . . Gloster, to those who did not know him, must have appeared one of the most delightful persons imaginable." In comparing this writer's account of Kean with Hazlitt's, it would seem that it is somewhat overcharged; for, although Hazlitt complains of Kean's being too ostentatious a hypocrite, too intelligible a villain, he speaks also of his giving at times too great an air of "tip-toe elevation" to the part. The writer in the *Dramatic Magazine* goes on to say that, according to all accounts, Garrick's Richard was highly lively and humorous. "Mathews some years ago spoke the opening soliloquy in the manner he had seen Tate Wilkinson give his imitation of Garrick. The lines were not growled out in a snappish dissatisfied tone and manner, but with a cheerful and highly animated look and an exulting spirit, not as if the clouds he mentioned were buried (instead of in the ocean) in the dark bosom of the speaker." Mr. Irving has clearly seized the humorous side of the character here spoken of; and he has also avoided all ostentation of hypocrisy and villainy; it is possible to think of his Richard as of a man who seemed to mere acquaintances "one of the most delightful persons imaginable." At times he misses something of the natural gaiety and high spirits of the character; and

at others, notably in the tent scene, he seems to attach more importance to the stings of conscience than so bold and light-hearted a villain as Richard was likely to do. But by doing this he gains something in dramatic effect of light and shade; and throughout, in the sarcastic passages of the play he is admirable. The opening soliloquy was in some respects better spoken on the first night than it has been on a later occasion when the actor discovered something of a tendency to sluggish and monotonous utterance which has marred some of his other performances. His action and look as he speaks of grim-visaged war capering "to the lascivious pleasing of a lute" are admirable in their mocking scorn, and the change of tone as he dwells upon his own deformity is highly effective, although there is perhaps too much savagery in his rage as he sums up his grievances against nature. It would be more in accordance with our notion of Richard's talent for turning everything to his own amusement and profit if here he took the same tone of humorous triumph that he does after his courtship of Lady Anne, or of wicked mirth that possesses him as he tells how he has got Clarence mewed up, "about a prophecy which says that G. Of Edward's heirs the murderer shall be." Another change of tone and look which is, we think, better considered, is adopted after Clarence goes out. The way in which the smile of affection and the caressing voice gradually give way to the expression of triumphant hatred is admirably natural; in such touches as this Mr. Irving's power of grasping the dramatist's meaning and giving it apparently spontaneous expression comes out better than in speeches which appeal more directly by their violence to an audience, but in which Mr. Irving is apt, in the momentary excitement, to lose control over his resources. From many instances of the actor's brilliant interpretation of suddenly changing emotion may be selected the transition from the smooth villainy of his courtship to the harsh tone of command in which he cries "Take up the corse, Sirs."

The scene of the courtship is one that presents unusual difficulties to an actor; the rapidity with which Lady Anne's repugnance is overcome is so great as to be almost incomprehensible; and it is Mr. Irving's merit that, by his admirable assumption of adulation, and of penitent, humble looks through which one can scarce discern a gleam of expectant victory, he makes the scene seem probable. But for its success Miss Isabel Bateman is no less to be praised than Mr. Irving; without her skilful representation of the graceful weakness which made Lady Anne fall a prey to Gloster's seductive tongue, all Richard's plausibility might fail to make one accept the incident as natural. There is a strange reading here adopted, which does not strike one as happy. The line "Out of my sight! thou dost infect mine eyes," is delivered, not as an expression of repulsion, but as if Lady Anne already felt herself giving way to Richard's arts, and feared to fall completely within his power. This is in contradiction to the stage direction—"She looks at him scornfully"—which comes twenty lines later, and jars somewhat with the otherwise well-managed gradual progress of the scene. Another point to which Miss Isabel Bateman might give attention is that swords, unless they are rapiers, generally have sharp edges; and that Lady Anne, if she had grasped the blade of Richard's sword in her closed hand, would probably have cut her fingers. As a matter of history, Lady Anne's marriage with Gloster is easily explained by the fact that she was hiding, disguised as a cook-maid, from Clarence, who was married to her eldest sister, and wanted the whole Warwick estates for himself. Richard, it may be observed, was only twenty when he wooed her, and it is interesting to find that, on the death of his son by her, at the age of ten, he, according to an old chronicler, "run almost mad."

The third scene of the first act in Shakspeare becomes the first of the second act in the Lyceum arrangement, according to which Queen Margaret is introduced, not perhaps very wisely, to do her cursing. Miss Bateman deserves credit for having, in the interest of the drama, disfigured herself with grey tangled hair and hollow cheeks, and for delivering her speeches with much vigour. Unfortunately the vigour is not of the right kind; to render desirable the spectacle of a half-mad woman cursing and swearing at every one a fiery passion is wanted, which Miss Bateman, who has great dramatic qualities in other directions, does not apparently possess. As a result the scene is, as far as Queen Margaret is concerned, painful without being impressive, and its interest is derived from the byplay of Mr. Irving, to which our only objection is that he seems too much impressed by Margaret's threats of the torments of remorse and reference to his deformity. The scene following this, of Clarence's murder, is retained, and there is some force in Mr. Bentley's delivery of the dream. His elocution, however, is marred to a great extent by such gurglings and gaspings in the throat between his words as might come from him if he were in truth drowning; and his attitudes are assumed with too obvious an intention. There is an excellent grimness of humour in Mr. Mead's Murderer.

From this we must pass to the third act, in the first scene of which may be noted Mr. Irving's extremely plausible gentleness and confidence to the children, his well-imagined byplay with his dagger while Buckingham and Catesby talk, and the sudden fierceness of "Chop off his head, man; somewhat we will do," in answer to Buckingham, giving place to a persuasive promise of an earldom when he sees that he has somewhat shocked his questioner. The scenes within the Tower and at Baynard's Castle in this act are run together, which makes the action a little sudden, but it might have been difficult to find any other way of compressing the act into reasonable limits; here Mr. Irving's smooth and cheerful

aspect and his subsequent passionate denunciation of Hastings are alike good, and his reluctant acceptance of the crown is the essence of wily dissimulation; his look of fiendish exultation at Buckingham as the curtain falls, while his face is hidden from the rest by a Prayer-book, is especially fine. The well-known contemptuous rejection of Buckingham's suit in the next act is given with what seems to us the just interpretation. Richard's voice takes a harsh, insulting tone as he asks, "Well, what's o'clock?" and "I am not in the vein" is given with a bitter, mocking accent which we must prefer to the "stifled hatred and cold contempt" which Hazlitt thought should belong to the words.

In the scene on Tower Hill the actor is perhaps less successful than he has been up to that time, partly because the demand of her daughter's hand from Elizabeth is little more than a repetition of the courtship of Lady Anne. And here he seems to make a mistake in treating the answer to her, "You mock me, madam; this is not the way to win your daughter," as if it were the expression of petulant anger. It should rather, we conceive, be given in the same tone of insinuating submission that marks the rest of the scene. The end of this scene is spirited and bustling, and more in consonance with the daring restlessness of Gloster's character than the extreme depression which Mr. Irving gives to him in the tent-scene in the last act. It is true that he says himself that he has not "that alacrity of spirit nor cheer of mind" that he was wont to have; but this is surely a momentary feeling, which he would banish quickly, and carefully conceal from those about him. Mr. Irving's Richard, however, remains anxious and depressed; paces about moodily, looks slowly and shiveringly out into the night, and seems to dread lying down to sleep. When he wakes from the visions that haunt him, he seems still too much overcome by terror. The actor, to bring the speech at this point within his own conception of Richard's mood, and be able to dwell only on the terror of awakened conscience, has omitted the line "Fool, of thyself speak well; fool, do not flatter," and has also stopped short at "if I die, no soul will pity me," leaving out "Nay, wherefore should they, since that I myself find in myself no pity to myself?" Mr. Irving is, we think, wrong in his conception of the scene, and is certainly not justified in cutting the text to suit it. Mr. Irving has, however, the excuse that the Richard of history, according to Sir Thomas More, was before Boeworth in a terrible state of agitation, confusion, and dread. "He never had quiet in his mind; never thought himself sure; when he went abroad his eyes whirled about; his hand was on his dagger. . . . he took ill-rest at night; rather slumbered than slept; troubled with frightful dreams; sometimes started up and ran about his chamber; so was his restless heart continually tossed and tumbled." Nevertheless it seems to us that Mr. Irving is mistaken in the idea which makes him, when Ratcliff enters, speak of his fearful dream as if he were still trembling under its influence; he would surely by that time have shaken it off, and begun to laugh at it. The bustle and animation of the last scenes are well conceived; but their execution is spoilt by the terrible indistinctness of the actor's speech as he grows more excited—a fatal fault, of which it is necessary before all things that Mr. Irving should cure himself. His death is finely imagined; he seems, as it is reported Kean did, to fight with the mere power of his will after his physical strength is exhausted; beaten down to his knees, he tears with his teeth at the sword that kills him, and when Richmond has left him dying, he still raises himself again to his knees, and glaring frantically at the advancing foe seems to struggle moment by moment with the death that presently beats him down.

On the whole, Mr. Irving's is a performance full of fine and fiery qualities, which it is to be hoped will not encounter the risk of being ruined by the senseless custom of long runs. No actor can night after night play such a fatiguing part as Richard III. without injury to himself and his art. When Kean was announced for a third representation of the part, even after the rest of a Sunday night, "cries of 'No! no!'" from every part of the house testified the sense entertained by the audience of the impropriety of requiring the repetition (so soon) of this extraordinary effort. It remains to add that the play is extremely well mounted at the Lyceum, and that none of the actors of smaller parts need be blamed, while in some cases, notably in that of Mr. Beaumont's King and Mr. Brooke's Richmond, there is special merit.

REVIEWS.

WYATT'S HISTORY OF PRUSSIA.*

REVIEWERS are at times accused of want of fairness in trusting too much to first impressions; but Captain Wyatt, we must confess, has tried us hard. He has chosen a theme not less seasonable than interesting; nor is it necessary to appeal to the authority of her present Sovereign's explicit declaration in support of the fact that the history of Prussia is to a great extent that of her army. Captain Wyatt's title-page is therefore full of promise, and one willingly takes for granted his professional qualifications for that part of his task to which he promises to

* *The History of Prussia: from the Earliest Times to the Present Day; tracing the Origin and Development of her Military Organization.* By Captain W. J. Wyatt. Vols. I. and II. (700—1390; 1390—1525). Longmans, Green, & Co. 1876.

pay special attention. The task itself is arduous enough, from whatever point of view it is treated; and in English historical literature, at all events, the field is a tolerably clear one, if we except the prolegomena and excursions of Mr. Carlyle, which are quite *sui generis*, and perhaps most commend themselves to those readers who have already studied the subject elsewhere. On the other hand, versatility is an attractive characteristic even in an author of neither a rhapsodic nor a satiric turn; and though we have not the advantage of a personal acquaintance with any of the previous works of which Captain Wyatt announces himself as the author, yet little fear of pedantry can be *prima facie* entertained with regard to an historian of Prussia who has already produced works severally entitled *Organization of Armies*, *Austro-Italian War*, *Revolutionary Shadows*, *Hungarian Celebrities*, besides others veiled under a modest &c. &c. To him few subjects can be unknown; and it is rather the secondary question, whether what he writes is all his own, which is likely to occupy his critics. Historians, however, do not make their materials; it is rather on their choice and use of these that their merit depends. After, therefore, perusing a table of contents of Vol. I. we came, with much interest, to the "Bibliography," or "Notice of the chief works either quoted or used as authorities"; but it was here that, before we had read a page of Captain Wyatt's text, we were affected with a vague sense of discomfort. The first work cited is the *Germania Antiqua* of Cluverius (Lugdunum, 1616), an entry which of course maintained expectation at its proper pitch. But the second takes us with a bound into a very different period of Prussian history; nor, inasmuch as the volumes before us only just reach the Reformation, is it easy to surmise the extent of the use the author can have made of Ancillon's *History of the French Refugees in Brandenburg*, which, by the way, his printer makes him cite as Amillon's. One or two other misprints follow in a score and a half of titles of books; which include, together with such recondite specialities as Mackintosh's *History of England* and Michelet's *History of France*, the following: "Pfister, J. C.—*Geschichte der Europäischen Staaten*. Hamburg, 1829." Pfister's *Geschichte der Deutschen* (continued by Bülow), a meritorious work not altogether up to the standard of modern historical research, of course forms only a part of Heeren and Ukert's well-known series, which likewise includes Stenzel's *History of the Prussian State*, not cited in Captain Wyatt's list. We might perhaps have spared Stenzel; but it is, to say the least, surprising to find no reference to Droysen's *Geschichte der Preussischen Politik*, and to observe that the edition of Ranke's *Preussische Geschichte* cited is that of 1848, and not that of which the first two volumes were published in 1874. This is no unimportant oversight; for whoever is interested in Prussian history, and whoever pays attention to the publications of the foremost of living German historians, can hardly fail to be aware of the significance of the new edition of Ranke's *Prussian History*. Not only has he rewritten for it the whole of the earlier part of the work, but, in a preface which attracted general attention, he declared that he had found it absolutely necessary to do so:—

Not only [he says] has the knowledge of events been largely increased by zealous and successful inquiry; but the general range of view has been widened. The events of the last years induced me . . . to show more fully than before, how the Brandenburg-Prussian State, destined in our own days to play so important a part in the universal movement of Europe and of the world, formed itself from the beginning, how it reached the stage where it was able to take a place among the European Powers.

In a word, then, Captain Wyatt's "bibliography" struck us as far from encouraging, and it was in no very hopeful frame of mind that we entered upon an examination of the results of historical studies so ill-furnished with their most necessary materials. Prejudiced or not, we have come to the conclusion that this *History of Prussia* is a very crude piece of book-making indeed; that it certainly will tell many readers things they did not know before, but tells these in such a way as to present the history of Prussia under the Teutonic Order as a mere thicket of events and names; that it "illustrates" by a series of utterly worthless appendices precisely those points which are most familiar to the ordinary student, while it leaves without sufficient explanation precisely those points in the progress of the history itself on which he requires light; that it has, in short, little if any value for the historical student, while the more lightsomely disposed "general" reader may be trusted to protect himself against being carried very far by so torpid a stream.

The book begins with an account of ancient Prussia and its "original inhabitants," concerning whose manners and customs the author gives some information, but of whose ethnology he has uncommonly little to say:—

There were Letts, Goths, Wends, Slaves, all living in proximity to each other and sub-divided into numerous tribes, but to which of all these the progenitors of the modern Prussians belonged it is impossible to trace.

It would be interesting to know what notion attached itself in the author's mind when he wrote a sentence that must have seemed to him eminently safe, to the term "the modern Prussians"; whether, for instance, he has any conception of the numbers of the remnant which in the Prussian monarchy of to-day can in any sense be spoken of as descended from the old "Prussian" nation. The etymology of the name Prussians he more excusably, though quite unnecessarily, leaves an open question; and considers himself

upon safer ground in affirming that the manners and customs of the old Prussians were originally very much akin to those of the ancient Germans

as described by Tacitus, mixed up with which were practices and observances borrowed from the Slaves and Scandinavians, in whose proximity they dwelt, and who, doubtless, influenced them in a variety of ways.

After this instructive preamble we have the description of the manners and customs aforesaid, and soon come to the history of the first Christian missions, to the establishment of the Order of the "Knights of Dobrin" and that of the Order of the Sword, and to the early history of the great Teutonic Order itself, in which both the former were ultimately absorbed. From this point onward the narrative drags along in annalistic fashion for a volume and a half, as a more or less unreadable history of the Teutonic Order. Nowhere does the author show any capacity for entering into the spirit of his subject—one of the finest to which an historian could lend his pen. Treitschke's masterly essay—as we venture to think it—on *Das deutsche Ordensland Preussen* might have inspired him with a sense of the magnificence of his theme, or at least with a desire to exhibit perspicuously the causes of the Order's greatness and those of its decay. And a single visit to the banks of the Nogat, where the most splendid monument of mediæval chivalry has recently been restored to a clear presentment of its solid grandeur, might have enabled him to invest his references to at least one locality with an interest which we fear is awakened in few English readers by the mere name of the Marienburg. Some day, perhaps, Mr. Freeman may discover it for us; and English travellers may begin to turn aside from the Berlin-Petersburg route to view the mighty castle on the plain, to linger in its vast passages, and to admire the splendour of the Master's Great Remter, and to recall the earlier memories of its Jesuitized church, from whose east-end the colossal mosaic figure of the Patroness of the Order still towers forth, like another Athene Polias, over the vast expanse of lands where her knights once held sway as the champions of the Faith. If, however, it was too much to expect from a History of Prussia, offering a connected account of the Teutonic Order, that it should have preserved to this the interest which it possesses, we may at least reasonably complain that Captain Wyatt's history of the Order is, except as a mere abstract of its annals, altogether unsatisfactory. It is not till we have reached the 58th page of Vol. II. that the attempt briefly made in the middle of Vol. I. to give some account of the internal organization of the Order is resumed, with reference to a later period in its history. Even so the terms in use are not adequately explained; up to that point the reader is but scantily enlightened on the functions of "Deutschmasters" and Comthurs, and the rest of them. Of the general conditions of life of the members of the Order; of the conflicts in it between inherent elements of strength and of weakness, we look in vain for a sketch. And as for its military organization, of which we expected to be specially instructed in its connexion with the "origin and development of the military organization" of Prussia in general, it is hardly more than incidentally treated; only once we come upon a *dictum* which we believe to be correct enough, but which certainly needed exposition for the benefit of the student:—

The Teutonic Order may be truly regarded as the first Government which possessed a regular standing army; in fact, the present organization of distinct command is only a development of the old system.

But all hope for more is at once disappointed by the author's going on, in an utterly disjointed way, to instruct us that

In the towns the Haus Comthur sat on the bench; in country places the Comthur, who, assisted by some local men of rank or position, decided all ordinary cases.

Towards the close of this part of his book the author gains a little in fulness and vivacity in his account of the proceedings which ended in the conversion of East-Prussia into a duchy held as a Polish fief; the intrigues of Albrecht and the co-operation of Luther are here fairly brought out, and one or two significant letters from the Reformer are quoted. But, finding it necessary at this point to give an account of the previous history of Brandenburg, the author takes a fresh start, and, to the dismay of those of his readers who have struggled on with him as far as the year 1525, makes the following announcement:—

The history of the ancient inhabitants of Brandenburg is so closely connected with that of other German tribes, that we think it advisable first to give a condensed account of the German race, as derived from the earliest reliable historians. The first mention that we have of the German nations is about 120 B.C. Little or nothing is known of their origin, but it is presumed that they belonged to the Indo-European family on account of affinities in the German dialect with Latin, Greek, Sanscrit, &c.

Docendo discimus; and though the closing sentence of the above extract is singularly free from unwarrantable assumptions, there is a freshness about it which it is difficult to resist. That the word "Germani" is of German origin, and signifies "spearmen," is, on the other hand, an assumption not sanctioned by the most "reliable" authorities of the present day; but historical etymology is not Captain Wyatt's forte, as one might expect from a writer who speaks of the Cimbric and Teutonic as being "joined at Zurich by another tribe named the Tigurini." His general notions of early German history are not altogether of the most precise character; thus he speaks of the Salian Franks as towards the close of the third century "occupying that part of France to the North of the Loire"; and afterwards he summarily remarks that, about the year 437, "the Franks took possession of Gaul, and captured Cambray; and in 449 the Anglo-Saxons, under Hengist and Horsa, landed in England to assist the Britons against the Picts and Scots." Perhaps the choicest misprint in these volumes (which abound in every variety of such blemishes) is that which, in the partition of 843, makes "Charles the Bold" become "King of the Franks"; Louis

the German, it appears, "received for his share all the German territory to the West of the Rhine."

Clearly, therefore, it is safer to go on to the history of Brandenburg itself, which Captain Wyatt disposes of in the driest annalistic fashion, so that already in p. 382 he finds himself with more space at his command, and accordingly proposes to "give some account of the causes which led to the spread of Protestant doctrines over a great part of the Continent." Then follows a very summary sketch of the careers of Wiclif and Huss, which Captain Wyatt evidently regards as a redemption of his promise; for no sooner is Huss fairly brought to the stake than the curtain draws up on a pedigree of the House of Hohenzollern, which furnishes instructive, if not agreeable, reading for the space of thirty pages. The Burgrave Frederick of Nürnberg having been invested with the Electorate of Brandenburg, the reader is not unprepared for a short history of Nürnberg, and why should not something be added concerning some of the other Imperial cities of Germany? In the course of this sketch, or whatever it is, we learn that "the Hansa consisted of upwards of eighty of the principal towns of North Germany," a statement of which we doubt the accuracy, though we do not know to what period Captain Wyatt refers. In any case, it is unnecessary to discuss any point relating to the Hanseatic League with our author, who (Vol. I. p. 119) innocently repeats the obsolete fallacy that it arose out of the alliance between Lübeck and Hamburg, concluded in the year 1241, and an earlier alliance between the Hamburgers and the Frisians.

We cannot part from this so-called *History of Prussia* without referring to the extraordinary vagaries of spelling and nomenclature in which its author roams fancy-free. He employs not only German and English forms of geographical names, but German and English terminations, with absolute impartiality, speaking of Silesia and Liefland, Cujavia and Saccalanien, in almost the same breath. He uses "Warmier" as an English plural, and presents geography with the hybrid form "Vor-Pomerania." Strassburg on the Drewenz he spells Strasbour, and the wife of Count Frederick of Zollern he calls the Countess d'Urach, so that French orthography also may have its rights. But the oddest of Captain Wyatt's eccentricities of this kind is perhaps his use of that misused particle the German *von*. Not only do the several Grand-Masters appear as Von Salza, Von Osterna, and so forth, for that is a usage which is unfortunately common enough with English writers, who will not condescend to copy German usage in this respect; but "Carl von Bessart" (his real name was Carl Beffart), who was commonly called Carl von Trier, is afterwards mentioned as Von Trier; and, stranger still, Margrave Henry of Meissen figures as Von Meissen. And while on this subject we may express a doubt whether the account given in page 389 of Vol. I. of the unfortunate distinction established among the Knights of the Order about the year 1326 be correct. According to it

the Grand-Master, at the instigation of the aristocratic element, proposed the following regulation—namely, that those of the Order who were ennobled should henceforward be called *Herr*, and that those who were of very old families should receive the appellation of *Herr Von*.

This seemed in itself so absurd that we turned to Weber's *History of the Order*, and were rewarded for our search by finding the following more rational-looking notice of the change in question, which is quaint and pointed enough to deserve quoting in full:—

The honest, pious Orselen now committed a second grave mistake, by introducing into the Order a distinction between *higher* and *lower* nobility. The high nobility was alone to be allowed to take the predicate *Dominus* and *Von*, the others, "Those who are without their four quarters" (*die ohne ihr Vier Schilde seyn*) were to be simply called *fratres*, brothers; the former were to wear *brown Orgeln* (Velum, cap) and *white cloaks*, the latter only *grey cloaks* and *hats*. Offices and dignities were already in possession of the higher nobility, and thus many brave men lost heart for entering into the Order, and many even seceded from it, which perhaps they would not have done had they known that things would not have altered for the better even in the *century of enlightenment*.

This extract indicates one of the chief causes which led to the decay of what henceforth became a hard and selfish oligarchy, the rigid inflexibility of whose internal institution, as Treitschke has pointed out, ill corresponded to the active policy of its government of the lands subject to it. We should have welcomed an opportunity of discussing some of the most salient points in its history and in that of the Germanization of the Baltic lands, in which it was one of the principal agents, but by no means the only one. Captain Wyatt has not wholly omitted to refer to the great process of colonization which, from the tenth century onwards, Germanized the Eastern lands occupied by Slavs; but his notices are too scanty and scattered to furnish adequate materials for comment. On the other hand, he has here and there introduced valuable hints as to the early commercial relations between England and Prussia, a subject which would well deserve treatment in a separate monograph. The presence of English knights in the Baltic crusades is a better known fact; every one at least knows that Chaucer's Knight had "reyssed in Lettowe and in Ruce." If, as was some time ago suggested in this journal, the model of Chaucer's Knight was John of Luxembourg, it is worth directing attention to Captain Wyatt's mention of King John's crusade against the Samogitians in 1328. He was accompanied by several Englishmen, headed by "Count Thomas of Orford," as Captain Wyatt first calls him; he becomes "the English Earl of Orford" a few pages further on, and is called Count once more in due succession. The most famous English name, however, that connects itself with the early history of Prussia is that of "Henry, Earl of Derby, afterwards Duke of Lancaster," who led a contingent of three hundred men to the help of the Order against the Lithuanians

in 1390. These are merely points of incidental interest; the general significance of the subject is perhaps one which it requires the hand of a master fully to bring out, but which a treatment like that adopted in the volumes before us—half perfunctory, half discursive—is certainly ill adapted for making clear to English readers.

SURVIVALS OF EARLY ENGLISH WORDS.*

WE have before us a number of publications of the English Dialect Society, to which we may very likely some day come back. But here among them is one, the thinnest of the number in physical size, which distinctly stands out as having, in another sense, the most in it of the whole party. It is perhaps not an unfair arrangement that, while certain others collect facts, Dr. Morris should think about the facts and comment on them.

There is a phrase which perhaps may not be entitled to a place in any Glossary of English Dialects, because it is not, we feel sure, confined to any particular district, and because it has no claim to rank as Early English, or as English at all. This is the phrase, "It's a very casu'ty thing." "Casu'ty" is, in any case, what philologists call a "loan-word," and, like many other loan-words, it is used in a sense which, according to its strict etymology, is ungrammatical. "Casu'ty," if it is to be used at all, should not be used as an adjective. Yet the phrase is expressive. A "casu'ty thing" is a thing liable to casualties—such as Sir Richard Baker records in his *Chronicles*—a thing whose ups and downs depend a good deal on accidents, and the issue and fate of which cannot be safely foretold before. The weather may be called a "casu'ty thing"; so may horses, and, the more valuable the horses, the more "casu'ty." So, we suspect, might war and politics, if war and politics came within the range of thought of those who use the phrase. But, in going through Dr. Morris's little tract, the thought has been brought strongly home to us that, of all "casu'ty things," none is more "casu'ty" than language. From one side indeed language has its rules, and rules that are sure enough. From another side nothing seems more open to the influence of mere chance. Phonetic changes go by a strict rule, though we have not yet quite got to the bottom of the principles on which that rule is founded. It is in the use of words that the chief domain of accident comes in. Why does one word live on, while another goes out of use? Why does a word which dies out of the other cognate dialects live on in one only, or perhaps in two between which all thought of borrowing or mutual influence is impossible? One word goes up in the world, another goes down. Of two words which start from the same perfectly colourless level, one becomes honourable, another shameful, without any reason to be seen at first sight why it should be so. Sometimes, as in the case of "queen," a word actually divides into two, and becomes honourable in one spelling and shameful in another. One root throws out a vast family of derivatives, another has very few. These accidents affect both literary and merely spoken language. Or perhaps it might be truer to say that merely spoken language comes most thoroughly under the dominion of mere accident, while literary language comes largely under the influence of caprice and fashion, which are not quite the same thing as accident. Whenever there is the least shade of conscious thought about a change in language or anything else, something comes in which differs from sheer and healthy accident. In this little paper of Dr. Morris's we see well brought out how this or that word or form went on in this or that dialect after it had dropped out of the literary language, how one went on in one dialect and one in another, and how the local dialects kept a living power of growth, a power of unconsciously forming new words as they were wanted, which died out in the literary language. If we were constrained to use the phrases "living" and "dead" languages—phrases which we had much rather not use at all if we could help it—we should be inclined to say that a living language is one which can still make words at pleasure—make them, that is, without conscious thought or effort—and that a dead language is one which can no longer really make new words, but must call a new object either by a name borrowed from another language or by several words in its own language. Judged by this rule, among the chief modern languages High Dutch would be said to be still very lively, French would be quite dead, while English still keeps a little life. It seems impossible to make a new French word; the new thing, if it be called by a native name, must have a name which is really not a name, but a circumlocution. If it goes further than this, the utmost it can do is simply to form a noun from a verb, and the like. It cannot make compound words, as German can without stint or bound, and as English still can in a smaller measure. What Dr. Morris chiefly brings out is the far greater extent to which this power has survived in the local dialects as compared with the written English. He remarks:—

The process of word-formation has, to a great extent, been checked and limited in the literary dialect, since it is so much easier to borrow words ready made than to form new ones. The number of derivatives, therefore, from any given root are extremely few in our "book language" as compared with those in the earlier periods or in our patois.

We are rather surprised at finding Dr. Morris talking about "patois." It doubtless does him no harm; but it is a word which may

* *English Dialect Society. Series D. Miscellaneous. Miscellanies. I. On the Survival of Early English Words in our present Dialects. By the Rev. Richard Morris, M.A., LL.D. London: Trübner & Co. 1876.*

easily mislead his readers and learners, and the common use of which goes right in the teeth of all his own teaching. This, however, may pass. He gives a long list of words in the dialects of all parts of England; some of them old words which have stayed in use while they have been lost in the written speech, others words which seem to have been formed in this or that local dialect by a living and healthy process of word-making after the written language and the local dialect had parted off from one another. Saxon and Angle alike supply good examples. "Deedy," "deedily," "deedless," are all quoted by Dr. Morris as living Southern words; while Dr. Morris tells us that "eye" is a fruitful parent in Yorkshire, and includes among its offspring *ee-ful* (observant), *eeing* (discerning, perceiving), *eeny* (cellular), *ee-precief* (ocular demonstration), *ee-sconner* (the baleful glance). Of these *ee-precief*, which we may venture to spell *eye-proof*, is worth special notice, because it shows how easily a certain class of Romance words became thoroughly naturalized, how they put on a thoroughly English garb, and could be treated just as if they were natives. We feel "demonstration" to be foreign; we do not feel "proof" to be foreign. Here it is accordingly coupled with "eye," and makes such a delightful word as "eye-proof." With this we may compare, though the compound is formed with a somewhat different meaning, the "eye-service" of our version of the New Testament, but there the foreign origin of *service* stands out much more plainly than the foreign origin of *proof*.

The word "daft" barely lives in written English. Johnson knows no such adjective. He has a verb—"To daft, v.a. [from do aft], to toss aside, to throw away slightly; not used. Shakspeare." The earlier Bailey has no such verb, but he has the adjective "Daft, stupid, blockish, daunted." He marks it with C, which stands for "Country word." Here, then, we have in polite English a single survivor, and that one hardly acknowledged, while Dr. Morris can help us to a whole kindred vocabulary of local words:—

In Middle English we meet with *daffe* and *beduffen*; and as dialectic forms we find *daffe* (to chat, loiter, falter, confound, daunt), *bedaff* (to confuse), and we still retain *daft*; but where are the North-country *daff-uck* (a simpleton, fool), *daffle* (to become weak-minded, waver, change), *daff-like* (foolish), *daffish* (shy, modest), *daffy* or *duffy* (soft, insipid, foolish), *daff-head* (a blockhead), *daffly* (forgetful), *daffies* (silly folks), *daffish* (rather stupid), *daffiness* (imbecility)?

Dr. Morris goes on to remark that "not only do our local dialects surpass us in word-making, but they have gone far beyond us in preserving the original meaning of a word, and in extending its signification." He takes, for instance, the Old English "weorpan," the High-Dutch "werfen," which still lives on in the form of "warp," though it has quite lost its first and more general meaning of throwing. This last still survives in the name of the "mould-warp," if anybody still gives that name to the "little gentleman in velvet" whom Jacobites once held in such honour. Dr. Morris asks us to contrast our present narrow use of the verb with its Northern use, in which it still keeps the general sense of casting and throwing, but where it also means to bend—a transition to its narrower uses, physical and metaphorical—and also to lay eggs. One sees why "flat wide beds of ploughed land" should be called in East-Anglian "warps"—the plough does the same work of warping as the mould-warp; but it is less clear why the Southern warp should be "four of a thing, applied to herrings." One knows a "cast of fish," but one does not see why a "cast" should be four fish rather than three or five. Dr. Morris has a long list of words and roots which have lived on and branched off in the same way. What life there is, for instance, in the Northern "gathersome," which Dr. Morris is driven to explain as social. "Game" has a good many kindred words; but is Dr. Morris right in putting "gammer" among them? Mr. Wedgwood, ingenious as he always is, is also always dangerous; but surely his derivation of "gaffer" and "gammer" from "good father" and "good mother" seems more likely. Gammer has a superficial likeness to the French "commère," which has something like the same meaning; but we may be sure that the identity of the last two syllables is owing to nothing nearer than primæval Aryan connexion.

In a crowd of cases the local dialect gives us the meaning of a word which survives in written English in a form which, having lost its cognates, is unmeaning. "We say 'it is hazy,' but not 'it hazes,' it rains small." "Charwoman" has puzzled some from a deceptive likeness to "chair"; but Dr. Morris helps us to the North-country "char," business. Yet Johnson quotes both noun and verb from Dryden, as meaning work done by the day. We have known a clergyman speak of what is more solemnly called "occasional duty," as "going out charing." Is this merely a metaphor from the charwoman, or has Dr. Morris anywhere lighted on a *char-priest*? Dr. Morris goes on with a long string of local words in different dialects, perhaps more from the North than from any other part of England, which illustrate forgotten words and phrases in our early literature, from the ancient homilies of his own editing down to Shakspeare. Sometimes the most venerable words survive bodily. Dr. Morris quotes as North-country phrases a "carl-cat" and a "ween-cat," where the "ween," of course, is a slight corruption of *cwen* or *queen*. The "carl-cat" is specially charming, and it is specially charming to find him in the North; for it is in the diocese of York that we should naturally have looked for the first tom-cats to be heard of. It is manifest that a cat would not be called Tom till the name Tom had become familiar among men; and the unbroken series of Toms in England—as distinguished from a solitary Bishop of Dunwich ages before—begins

with Thomas of Bayeux, Archbishop of York. There could not have been a tom-cat in England earlier than 1070, and it is not likely that they began till long afterwards. As Dr. Morris has found the "carl-cat" and the "ween-cat" still in being, it is to be hoped that he has somewhere found, or may somewhere find, the "carl-fowl" and the "queen-fowl," venerable English names for the *ἀλεκτρυών* and *ἀλεκτρυόνα* of the Aristophanic Socrates. In the same list we come across "fang," to seize, a verb as old as when "Cerdic and Cynric West-Seaxna rice oufengon." The cognate noun still lives in the innermost parts of our jaws, but the verb has altogether vanished from our tongues. Lastly, we will quote the use of one word more, where an interpreter is certainly needed by one who understands standard English only:—

A North-country cattle dealer will say to a farmer, "I'll gie ya fifteen shillin' a-piece for thore hundred cows, an ya'll let ma shoot ten on em."

By shooting ten, he means expelling or driving out ten of the worst. So in the Cursor we read of the blind man who was healed by Jesus, that

Wiþ his þai shotte him as a dogge
Riȝt out of þaire synagog.

KEBLE'S OCCASIONAL WRITINGS.*

DR. PUSEY has done wisely to insert in his modest and very appropriate preface to this collection of Occasional Papers of John Keble's a letter from their common friend, Dr. Newman, to some correspondent unnamed, who had asked him for his "judgment upon Mr. Keble's literary merits." Like everything from the same pen, it is essentially characteristic of the author, and is also, as Dr. Pusey observes, "the most exquisite tribute that has been paid to the memory and to the genius of his friend." But it moreover explains with peculiar felicity the reasons which make any literary criticism of Keble so difficult. One of those reasons, indeed, is personal to Dr. Newman, whose very affection and reverence for his friend rendered him "unable to separate the writer from the man," or to approach his works in the spirit of an external critic; but other difficulties also are mentioned which will be felt by every reviewer, not in spite of, but in proportion to, his appreciation of the specialities of Keble's genius. His chief literary work, the *Praelectiones Academicæ*, which he delivered as Professor of Poetry at Oxford, was written in Latin, according to the provisions—since abrogated—of the statute regulating the duties of his chair. Another chief work was his edition of Hooker, where the editor must necessarily occupy a subordinate place, and where Keble, above all men, as well from reverence for the author as from innate modesty, "would put his author in the front and hide behind him." For it was, in fact, by no accident that his literary work is for the most part of a kind so incapable of being measured by a purely literary standard. "How," as Dr. Newman says, "can I paint a man who will not sit for his picture? how can I draw out his literary merits, when he considers it his special office to edit, or to translate, or to discourse in a dead language, or to sing hymns?" In Keble the ethical and intellectual elements were too closely interwoven for minute critical discrimination; to analyse the writer is to analyse the character of the man. "His religious instincts, his unworlly spirit, his delicacy of mind, his tenderness of others, his playfulness, his loyalty to the Holy Fathers, and his Toryism in politics, are all ethical qualities, and by their prominence give a character of their own, or personality, to what he has written; but these would not have succeeded in developing that personality into sight and shape in the medium of literature, had he not been possessed of special intellectual gifts which they both elicited and used." What another friendly critic has observed of his poetry is true in its measure of everything he wrote. Its leading characteristic is its "intense and absolute veracity," as being "in a very high degree the reflex of himself." And to all this it must be added that the work by which Keble will always be chiefly remembered, and by which he probably will be remembered as long as the English Church or the English language lasts, is one the secret of whose influence it is as hard to define as it is impossible to ignore. There are thousands and tens of thousands of Englishmen and Englishwomen over whose religious life the *Christian Year* has exercised a controlling power second only to that of their Bible and Prayer-Book; yet it is not easy to explain the precise nature of its subtle influence. We can but say, in the words of the great writer already quoted—published soon after his change of communion, and when therefore he felt bound to look with disapproval on Keble's position, though his personal regard for him remained unaltered—"It was the most soothing, tranquillizing, subduing work of the day; if poems can be found to enliven in dejection, and to comfort in anxiety, to cool the over-sanguine, to refresh the weary, and to awe the worldly, to instil resignation into the impatient, and calmness into the fearful and agitated—they are these." Dr. Newman adds presently that "his happy magic made the Anglican Church seem what Catholicism was and is." Putting aside the theological assumption implied in this form of expression, it indicates very truly the "magical" effect of the unpretending little volume on the fortunes of that Church which its author so loyally served and did so much to renovate. It was, if not his most laborious or matured, his most effective as well as his earliest, contribution to the revival with which his name is so prominently associated. We are, in fact, so accustomed to think and speak of Keble as "the author of the

* *Occasional Papers and Reviews*. By John Keble, M.A. Parker & Co. 1877.

Christian Year—of which we are here informed that no fewer than 140 editions and 305,500 copies had been sold between its publication in 1827 and 1873, when the copyright expired—that it requires something of an effort to regard him in any other aspect. It is not unnatural to think of him as a preacher, and his published sermons, no doubt, contain much in which devout minds will find matter of edification; but one does not so easily realize Keble as a reviewer or an essayist. In saying this, however, we are far from meaning to find fault with the issue of the present volume. On the contrary, we feel sure that the editor has exercised a sound discretion in carrying out the wish expressed by the late Sir John Coleridge, Keble's oldest friend, for its publication. Even if the intrinsic interest of the papers thus brought together had been less real than it is, the reputation of the author, and his position in the great religious movement of his day, would more than justify the last survivor of the great Tractarian leaders in thus, to use his own phrase, "gathering up the fragments which remain that nothing be lost."

The papers contained in this volume may be divided, broadly speaking, into two classes, literary and theological or controversial, the latter chiefly arising out of the Gorham case. There is a certain "opportuneness," as will presently appear, in the re-issue at the present moment of Keble's contributions to the discussion of the Gorham affair, and it is not perhaps unreasonable to surmise that the time of publication has been determined by a desire of appealing to his authority on questions which are now again being agitated among us. But a word must first be said of those reprints which have a more direct and personal interest as exhibiting the mind of the writer. The articles in the *British Critic* on the Life of Sir Walter Scott and the Unpublished Papers of Bishop Warburton are full of suggestive matter—the last especially, which includes a general review of the tone of eighteenth-century theology, and a brief, but very just and thoughtful, criticism on the argument of Warburton's famous work on the *Divine Legation of Moses*. But there are special reasons for directing the reader's attention to a much earlier article, that on Sacred Poetry, reprinted from the *Quarterly Review*. In the first place, it may be said, like the preface to the first edition of Wordsworth's Poems, to contain an exposition of the author's theory of his own art, and thus virtually to indicate the canons of criticism by which he would desire to be himself judged, only that, while Wordsworth is simply constructing a modern *Ars Poetica*, Keble is dealing with his own particular department—namely, sacred poetry. And, in the next place, this article appeared in 1825, just two years before the first edition of the *Christian Year* was published, and when, as we now know, a good deal of it was already written. It therefore exhibits to us the writer's estimate if not of his achievements, of his aims. The particular volume of poems he is reviewing, by Josiah Conder, is one with which we cannot profess to have any further acquaintance than may be gathered from the extracts here given; but he has in fact used it to illustrate his own ideas of the true nature and functions of sacred poetry; and in this lies the peculiar interest of the article, which bears throughout the stamp of that "intense and absolute veracity" attributed by Bishop Moberly to Keble's writings. He begins with a very characteristic caution against treating religious poems, "written with any degree of sincerity and earnestness, merely as literary efforts." They have a higher object, and therefore "the most considerate reviewer of a volume of sacred poetry will think it a subject on which it is easier to say too much than too little." The first essential of such poetry is that it should be real; and it fails so far as it is found "wanting in truth, and in that depth of thought which is as necessary to the higher kinds of poetical beauty as to philosophy or theology itself." This view is illustrated from the Psalter, where we are impressed with the sacred writer's "total carelessness about originality, and what is technically called effect"; and all sacred hymns, we are told, should bear the same character. It follows that "an instinctive attachment to his subject" is especially requisite in a sacred poet, and hence the feelings he expresses should be "specimens of his general tone of thought, not sudden bursts and mere flashes of goodness." There is a certain analogy between sacred music and sacred poetry, which is also "a kind of plain chart, fervent, yet sober; awful, but engaging; neither wild and passionate nor light and airy." The worshippers of Baal may be rude and frantic, but "the true prophet, speaking to or of the true God, is all dignity and calmness." Keble proceeds to criticize with much subtlety and force, and on grounds both of natural and revealed religion, Dr. Johnson's notion that "contemplative piety cannot be poetical." And then follows a comment, which our readers will do well to study for themselves, on the two leading sacred poets of England, as he regards them, Spenser and Milton. Milton's treatment of vice is happily contrasted with Shakespeare's, though by both alike it is always made contemptible or odious, in that "Milton was of a cast of mind originally austere and rigorous; he looked on vice as a judge, Shakespeare as a satirist." The explanation suggested of what has struck so many readers of *Paradise Lost*—that it is hardly possible to avoid feeling sympathy with Satan as the hero of the poem—appears to us perfectly just. "The most probable account surely is, that the author himself partook largely of the haughty and vindictive republican spirit which he has assigned to the character, and consequently, though perhaps unconsciously, drew the portrait with a peculiar zest." On the whole, we conceive that this article, which may be read in connexion with a still earlier review of Copleston's *Praelectiones Academicæ*, will be found full of special as well as general interest by all genuine admirers of the *Christian Year*.

It is an ungrateful task to turn from such themes to the stormy region of theological controversy. But no notice of this volume would be other than conspicuously incomplete which omitted all reference to the series of papers occasioned by the Gorham case, marked as they are by the same intensity of personal conviction—exercised on very different subject-matter—as those we have already dwelt upon. And there is a further reason for calling attention to this part of the volume. One of the side issues raised in the present ecclesiastical contest, and which has been hotly disputed in some quarters, concerns the continuity of the modern Ritualist policy with that of the elder Tractarian school. This is of course a simple question of fact, quite independent of the right or wrong of the course pursued in either case; and the papers here presented to us throw considerable light on the fact. It will be readily admitted that no better spokesman of the High Church school could be found than Keble; and it is therefore a matter of some interest to know what line he took as to the relations of the Church of England to the judicial courts which regulate her doctrine and worship. For it was this rather than the particular decision about baptism—strongly as he denounced it—which constituted in his mind the fundamental point at issue in the Gorham controversy. And it is this again, rather than the minute details about dress and ceremonial so elaborately discussed the other day before the Judicial Committee, which, in the judgment of all intelligent observers, constitutes the fundamental difficulty of the situation now. No reader of this volume can doubt that the line taken in this matter by the English Church Union, as representing an important section of the High Church party, whether he approves of it or not, is identical in principle with that recommended and urged with unmistakable emphasis by Keble some five-and-twenty years ago. Besides occasional references elsewhere, there are four papers dealing expressly with the questions raised in the Gorham controversy; three Pastoral Tracts, on "Trial of Doctrine" and "A Call to Speak Out," published in 1850, one before and one after the final decision had been pronounced, and a third on the Exeter Synod of 1851, followed by an article on it reprinted from the *Christian Remembrancer*. It is of course impossible to analyse all these publications. We must content ourselves with briefly indicating the author's point of view. We shall venture here and there to italicize critical words in his indictment. As to the doctrine sanctioned by the Gorham decision, it is roundly denounced as "a heresy which amounts to no less than the denial of all Sacramental Grace," and "the false doctrine which an intrusive Court has just sanctioned." Disestablishment must be welcomed in preference to submission to such a Court. "Let us tell them (the Bishops), boldly or gently, that, much as we value the so-called protection of the State, we love the Truth of Christ and the souls of his redeemed more; and that we earnestly hope the day will soon come when they shall discern, *what to us is palpable already*, that the Church's temporal privileges and endowments would be well parted with, if need be, as the price of freedom from State control." Or, as it is still more strongly expressed elsewhere, "We had rather be a Church in Earnest separate from the State, than a Counterfeit Church in professed Union with the State." In the first Pastoral Tract, published before the Gorham judgment, the constitution of the ecclesiastical Courts is denounced as an intolerable grievance, to which neither the Dissenters nor "the Presbyterians established in Scotland" would submit for a moment; and the common objection, that the Church of England has for three centuries acquiesced in it, is carefully examined and repudiated. The existing state of the law had at most been only "borne with through ignorance." The Gorham trial was at most only the second, if not the first, case of any doubtful or important question of doctrine coming before the Judicial Committee, which differed materially, both in its composition and the source of its authority, from the Court of Delegates, established in Henry VIII.'s reign; and to this new Court the Church of England and her clergy have neither given their assent, nor do they owe any obedience, except "in the same sense as a conscientious Dissenter was bound to obey those old Acts of Parliament which fined him for not going to Church," that is to say, in the sense of being bound to disobey, and submit to the penalty. "We must demur to the law, and quietly take the consequences." It is expressly denied that the clergy are bound by their ordination vows or engagements to recognize this civil Court, while they are in fact so absolutely bound to reject its jurisdiction that they cannot in conscience appear before it at all; "if they are wronged elsewhere [viz., in the Court of Arches, as it then was] they will be precluded from appeal, and from defence, if any appeal against them." All this is carefully explained to hold good equally "whether the decision in the present [Gorham] case be according to the Nicene Creed or no," and it is asked whether, "if it be adverse" (as it was), "a Bishop or Archbishop acting on it, would not involve in direct heresy himself and all in communion with him?" At all events, if an heretical decision be given, "let our protest be, once for all, uttered, and let all Christendom sing with it, that this Court is not, cannot be, the Church; that we will not, cannot be, bound by it."

If this was Keble's language before judgment was pronounced, it is not wonderful that it should become stronger after a judgment had been recorded sanctioning "the denial of all sacramental grace." He hoped at first that the Bishops would "contravene it in the only effectual way," by "openly refusing institution to any one notoriously holding" the doctrine it had condoned. He insisted on the necessity of con-

tinuous and unflinching resistance, and thus described the existing state of the law:—"Our Prime Ministers and Chief Justices, with their Acts of Parliament, are dealing with us and our parishes as a tyrant might who should get a man's wife and children into his power, and say, 'Come in to my terms, or I butcher them.'" Much more might be quoted to the same effect; but our space is limited, and sufficient proof has already been offered that, in resisting the authority of the Judicial Committee, and what Keble would certainly have considered the equally or still more secular Court constituted under the Public Worship Act of 1874, the High Churchmen of our own day are strictly acting on the principles he laid down. This, we need hardly repeat, does not prove that they are right; but it does go far to prove what has been almost fiercely denied—that they are keeping to the traditional lines of the party they profess to represent, and not setting up a new programme of their own.

It was impossible to avoid all reference to a question which stared us in the face in taking up this remarkable volume, and on which it is evident that the author felt very keenly. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that the book is exclusively or mainly occupied with polemical discussion. On the contrary, we have said more than enough to make it clear that those who have no taste for such topics will yet find abundant matter of interest for all religious and cultivated minds.

CAMERON'S JOURNEY ACROSS AFRICA.*

THE popular imagination was readily impressed last year with a general idea of Lieutenant Cameron's feat of African travel. It was announced that the young naval officer had walked three thousand miles across the width of that vast continent, from the East coast about Zanzibar to the Atlantic at Benguela. He had traversed an extensive region of the central interior which was heretofore represented by a blank space in our maps. A British sailor had boldly steered his way through a huge block of the solid mainland, and gone right on from sea to sea. His actual performance was that of travelling over a large tract of almost unknown country in the middle breadth of Africa, not indeed where its breadth is greatest, and completing an overland passage from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic, though by a very indirect route. Dr. Livingstone had done much the same thing, in more southerly latitudes, when he ascended the Liambéji from the Upper Zambesi, and came down to the Atlantic seaport of Loanda. He had also provided a basis and starting-point for Mr. Cameron's main enterprise, by discovering the chain of lakes and the Lualaba river system of the interior as far as Nyangwé, though he was mistaken in fancying that they might flow to the Nile. It has been proved by Cameron's inspection of the mighty stream at Nyangwé, and by his inquiries about its further course, that this cannot possibly belong to the Nile, and that it is, in all likelihood, the Congo. He was not permitted to follow the great river, but was compelled at Nyangwé to turn southward, and to enter a region quite new to accredited European travellers. This was the extensive native kingdom of Urua, with the adjacent Casambi and Ulunda territories, covering the central watershed between the Congo and Zambesi tributaries, north-west of the Katanga highlands and of the superior mountain ranges. Commander Cameron's description of this part of his journey, which occupied him from September 1874 to the autumn of 1875, including a detention of nearly five months in Urua, is the most important portion of his work. Next in value is the service he has rendered to African physical and commercial geography by his survey of all the southern half of Lake Tanganyika, along both its eastern and western shores. There is also much scientific interest in his probable discovery of a western outlet connecting Tanganyika with the interior system of lakes and rivers—the lakes Bangweolo, Moero, and Kamolondo or Ulenge; the rivers Luvwa and Lualaba, which Livingstone had explored. We have indicated what appear to be the substantial contributions of Commander Cameron to geographical knowledge. His scientific observations of latitude and longitude and elevation are said to be more precise and abundant than those of most other travellers. He has done much, in short, towards perfecting our map of the interior of Africa; and he has set a commendable example of resolute patience and perseverance, as well as of discretion and humanity in his behaviour to the native people.

These substantial merits of the author personally, and these valuable additions to our acquaintance with a region that displays many surprising and promising features, make up for the literary defects of his book. It is, we must admit, rudely and clumsily written; but its very simplicity and downright straightforwardness may prove a recommendation. Commander Cameron has no romantic adventures to parade, and is evidently not the man to invent them for a narrative of this sort, any more than he would for a despatch to the Admiralty. Nor did he require to make a sensation by reporting his own martial achievements in the sinking of canoes and the burning of villages. In one instance, at Kamwawi in Urua, by an unfortunate mistake on the part of the natives, his party were harassed for two or three days, were obliged to fortify their post, and to fire some rifle-shots in return for arrows; but peace was easily restored. Our country-

man suffered, however, at least the usual amount of fatigue in African travel, and frequent prostration by fever. He had much trouble with his unruly followers, and with extortionate or inhospitable native chiefs. Two of his comrades at starting, Dr. Dillon and Mr. Robert Moffat fell a prey to the unwholesome climate. He parted early with the third, Lieutenant Cecil Murphy, R.N., who conducted Livingstone's remains to Zanzibar. Mr. Cameron went on, after receiving the honoured corpse at Unyanyembe, to secure a box which had been left at Ujiji, containing a part of Livingstone's last journals and maps. Having arrived there, on the shore of Lake Tanganyika, which is about six hundred miles inland, he resolved to use the funds given him for the assistance of Livingstone in continuing Livingstone's work of exploration.

Lake Tanganyika, first described by Captain Burton, who was there with Captain Speke in 1858, offers the best apparent means of commercial settlement and intercourse. Similar facilities, indeed, though perhaps to a less degree, may be found in Lake Victoria Nyanza and Lake Nyassa. Each of these fine inland waters, at all times navigable, with fertile and populous countries along their shores, is within a practicable distance of the Indian Ocean. The Sultan of Zanzibar has just assured Dr. Kirk of his goodwill towards any project for making a road between either of these lakes and the seacoast over which he claims to rule. Many caravans of the Arab merchants have long been accustomed to make their annual journeys from Bagamoyo to the lake-port of Ujiji. They had created the intermediate station of Unyanyembe, a permanent Arab settlement, 450 miles from the sea, and 180 miles from the lake. It might have been supposed that this piece of Eastern Africa, directly opposite the much frequented island port of Zanzibar, would have become quite familiar to English travellers, as well as to the Arabs, a good while ago. The only serious difficulties they have met with in getting across it have been caused either by the flooding of the Makata swamp, and the pestilential air of that district after the rainy season, or by some accidental feuds between the Arabs and a party of the Wanyamwesi, further on towards the lake. These obstacles, fully displayed, to say the least of it, in Mr. Stanley's narrative, could not be perpetual or inevitable; and we may hope that they will cease to hinder a regular approach to the near side of Tanganyika. The route from Unyanyembe to Ujiji chosen by Lieutenant Cameron, differing both from that of Stanley and from Burton's, led him through a new and interesting tract of country. But it is now time to desist from speaking in general of the Ugo and Unyamwesi territories as an unknown region, and of Ujiji as a place of doubtful access.

The survey of Lake Tanganyika, executed by Mr. Cameron in the early part of 1874, is complete for both its shores to the south of Ujiji. Its northern parts had already been viewed by Burton and Speke in 1858, and by Livingstone and Stanley in 1871. This wonderful feature in the physical geography of Africa deserves an attentive study. It seems to lie in a portion of the same great flaw or fissure, caused by some continental upheaval at a remote geological period, that produced the basins of Lake Albert Nyanza, to the north, and of Lake Nyassa, which lies further to the south of Tanganyika. The elevation of this lake above the sea-level is 2,754 feet, and its shores are generally mountainous, rising 2,000 feet or 3,000 feet in some places. Nearly four hundred miles long, from twelve to thirty miles broad, and of enormous depth, with no bottom sounded at 2,000 feet, this large body of fresh water is fed by more than a hundred streams, and perhaps also by countless hidden springs. It was formerly thought to be connected with the Albert Nyanza, and thus to be the source of the Nile; but its north end was examined by Livingstone and Stanley five years ago, and proved to have no outlet. But there is great reason now to believe that it is one of the chief sources of the Congo; for the Lukuga, found by Mr. Cameron to flow westward out of this lake, is believed to reach the Luvwa above Lake Kamolondo. No region of the earth can show a system of natural channels and basins for surface-drainage to be compared with that of the Congo for its complexity and diversity. Indeed its aggregate volume of waters is less only than that of the Amazons and one or two among the greatest of rivers. We may be allowed to consider that Lake Tanganyika bears the same relation to the Congo as its neighbour Lake Albert Nyanza bears to the Nile. It is to be hoped that both the one and the other, and Lake Nyassa also, will at no distant time become the seat of a regular commercial intercourse with the numerous populations of Central Africa. This ought to be conducted by persons responsible to civilized Europe, and not by the Arabs exclusively. The amount of mutual benefits conceivable from such a state of affairs, were it once realized, is beyond present calculation. No insuperable difficulty, either physical or political, seems as yet to present itself to an enterprise of this kind at private risk. There are many reasons why English public opinion should wish it a fair success.

The later part, however, of Commander Cameron's narrative describes the countries and people we have named far west of Tanganyika, in the Urua and Ulunda region beyond the Katanga mountains; and this affords a less agreeable prospect. European trade is here carried on by low mongrels and mulattos from the Portuguese West African colonies. Their presence has unhappily exerted a baneful and mischievous influence on the native race. Its effects are reported by Mr. Cameron to be very much worse than those of the Arab slave-trade among the Manyema and other nations within reach of the East coast. The Portuguese Government certainly ought not to be behind the Mohammedan sovereign of Zanzibar in undertaking to check those abominable practices of which men like Alvez and Coimbra seem to be commonly guilty. Mr. Cameron, having travelled south from Nyangwé, after his disappointment in

* *Across Africa*. By Verney Lovett Cameron, R.N., C.B., D.C.L., Commander Royal Navy, Gold Medallist Royal Geographical Society. 2 vols. London: Haldy, Labister, & Co.

not getting canoes to descend westward to the Congo, fell in with this pair of half-breeds at the court of King Kasongo. He was compelled, though with much reluctance, to join their returning caravan to Bihé, an inland district of Benguela, which belongs to the Portuguese; it seems to have been his only way to reach the West coast. A revolting account is given of their behaviour, and of the morals and manners prevalent among their class; while no other persons connected with a civilized nation have yet gained a commercial footing in the interior on that side. They leagued their bands of armed followers with those of Kasongo to perpetrate cruel outrages upon the defenceless people all over the country, plundering and destroying village after village, slaughtering the men, and driving the women and children as slaves or cattle to be sold in distant markets. Mr. Cameron witnessed some atrocious proofs of their inhumanity; but his expressions of disgust were unheeded, and their vexatious, if not treacherous, conduct to himself was a grievance beyond redress. The delays and losses occasioned to him by the fraudulent conduct of Alvez, and by the caprice of the negro monarch, were a great impediment; and it seems likely enough that secret intrigues on their part had defeated his intention to explore the Upper Congo.

The last part of Mr. Cameron's journey to the coast, between Bihé and Benguela, though within the Portuguese territory, was attended with the severest pains and dangers to life. He and his people, after leaving Alvez at Bihé, were almost destitute of the means of buying food from the inhabitants of the country. They seem to have narrowly escaped perishing of starvation and fatigue on the ordinary road frequented by inland traders within a few days' march of the seaport town. Cameron, with half-a-dozen of his best men, pushed on to Katombela, on the coast, and procured relief to be sent back for the others. He was very ill with scurvy, and might have died a miserable and lonely death, close to the dwellings of civilized and hospitable European settlers, if he had been delayed some hours longer. The greatest difficulty in African travel seems, after all, to be the necessity of carrying a great load of cumbersome goods, such as bales of cotton-cloth, to pay for needful provisions and lodgings in the native towns or hamlets. It is not in every district that beads or cowries will pass for currency, and the conveyance of heavy wares, demanding a numerous train of "pagazi" or luggage-porters, makes a double or treble requirement of provisions and nightly shelter. With these servants and the "askari," or armed men of the guard, a simple European traveller must lead about one hundred hired retainers on his way through the wilderness, and must have wherewithal to pay for their entertainment in every village. There is seldom leisure to look for game, and instead of helping oneself from the bounty of free nature, one is put to sordid shifts of bargaining, or else begging, at the hands of barbarian hosts. The common people of almost every nation visited by our author appear to be well disposed. But some of their chiefs or princes were very bad specimens of the noble savage; Kasongo of Urna, from the reports of his habitual cruelty, perfidy, and debauchery, should be as vile a monster as ever reigned on earth. We cannot feel sanguine about the speedy realization of Commander Cameron's visions of improvement in the region lying between the head waters of the Congo and those of the Zambesi. It presents admirable facilities, by nature, for the opening up of inland navigation, as well on the western as on the eastern side of Africa. But from the internal slave-trade, which seems beyond the reach of European Powers to stop it by their treaties and their naval forces, there has arisen a general conspiracy to keep out more legitimate and beneficial commerce. Only in the neighbourhood of the great East African lakes, if a mercantile settlement can be formed on their shores in communication with Zanzibar, do we yet see a practicable door of entrance into that dark region of the tropical world, with its hidden store of various natural riches still waiting to be opened and enjoyed.

BURTON'S ETRUSCAN BOLOGNA.*

THIS is a book of which we must speak very plainly. It is full of careless misstatements and palpable contradictions. It seems to exhibit a vast apparatus of learning, but of this learning much is evidently obtained at second or third hand. It is written in a style which is often intolerably clumsy; while from beginning to end there is not a trace of the judicial impartiality and patient care without which no man is warranted in attempting to deal with difficult historical and philological questions. In his preface, written at Hyderabad, or, as he prefers with greater exactness to spell it, Haydarâbâd, Captain Burton pleads what he calls the "single-revise excuse," his "old apology for minor sins of omission and commission." He ends his volume at Watson's Hotel, Bombay, "with the hope that readers will take kindly into consideration the circumstances under which it was written." We have no intention of doing otherwise. Of the minor sins for which he asks indulgence, whatever they may be, we do not mean to take any notice; but amongst these we cannot count blundering misrepresentations which put into the mouths of other writers what they have never said. We may pardon many a slip or pass by many a mistake caused simply by lack of books that are seldom accessible except in great libraries; but the impossibility of getting at them is surely a reason for caution in the handling of

subjects in which accuracy and consistency are indispensable. No circumstances, however, can be pleaded as an excuse for sins against justice and fair play.

The writer whom Captain Burton has singled out for his fiercest assaults is Mr. Isaac Taylor. With the defence of Mr. Taylor's hypothesis and of the conclusions which he draws from it we are not here concerned. Our opinion of his *Etruscan Researches* has perhaps been sufficiently expressed already (*Saturday Review*, May 23, 1874); all that we need now do is to show the temper in which Captain Burton professes to criticize them, and the measure of respect to which his peremptory verdict is entitled. The phases through which the Etruscan mystery or controversy has passed during the present century are pretty well known. To the supposition of Prichard that the Indo-European character of the old Etruscan language was tolerably well established, succeeded the theory of Donaldson that it was to be regarded as a relic of some Low-German or Scandinavian dialect corrupted by contact with Umbrian. Thus led into the wide Aryan field, Lord Crawford found, as he thought, abundant evidence for pronouncing it to be good High-Dutch. Tired out with this mere guesswork which made no attempt to distinguish between words of primary and of secondary importance in a language, Mr. Isaac Taylor resolved to search for Etruscan numerals, pronouns, and words denoting near affinity or the ordinary acts of common life, and then to see if the Turanian family of languages supplied the clue which had been vainly sought in the speech of the Aryan stock. His search was carried out with all honesty and good faith; but Captain Burton, far from making any effort to put Mr. Taylor's case fairly before his readers, contents himself with treating his work as almost beneath contempt. We are told that Mr. Taylor "starts with a thoroughly erroneous and absolute assertion which succeeds in vitiating almost every research," this assertion being that the ultimate and surest test of race is language. The exceptions to this rule are sufficiently well known. There may be tribes of American Indians, for example, who can now speak only Spanish; but it is seriously maintained that when the Etruscans, being themselves invaders, established themselves in Italy, they brought the language of some other people with them? What, again, amid the varying phases of opinion on that which, after all, is the great problem—namely, the Etruscan language—is the position of Captain Burton himself? In the *Athenæum* of March 28, 1874, he says:—"The Mongol theory" (meaning, of course, by this Mr. Taylor's theory) "is so valuable that I can only hope it will be taken up by Mr. Vambéry, the highest living authority." He adds that Etruscan antiquities had occupied much of his time in 1852, and expresses his hope of applying his Mongol theory "to the now well-known cemetery at Bologna." In the following year he announced, with some appearance of inconsistency, in his volume on the "Gorilla Land," that Corssen had completely solved the Etruscan problem, and that the language which Lord Crawford had taken to be High-Dutch was really nothing more than Latin. Now, however, he has seen fit to change his mind, and he has been led to do so, as he affirms (p. 228, note), partly by a consideration of the Etruscan numerals, and in part by the knowledge of "Corssen's undoubted failure," his present conclusion being that "Etruscan has no affinity with any known tongue." By speaking of the Etruscan numerals Captain Burton implies that he knows what the Etruscan numerals are; and we shall see presently what sort of consideration he has given to them, although we may still be at some loss to discover the grounds on which he has reached the conclusion that Corssen's failure is so decided. Indeed it is not easy to ascertain from anything that is said in this volume whether his verdict is the result of personal thought on the subject or merely an echo of the dictum of another. It is at least strange that one who looks on the old Etruscan as having no affinity with any known tongue should at the same time hold that it exhibits "perhaps a few 'Turanian affinities,' possibly derived from Finnish" (viii.), and that these Finnish affinities "deserve scientific investigation" (232).

But whatever may be either Captain Burton's conclusions or the foundations on which they rest, there is nothing in his book to show that he has fairly given his mind to the question and really pondered the facts of the case. Nowhere does he bring forward the several groups of sepulchral inscriptions, and give a list of the words which, from the analogy of such inscriptions in English, must be and can only be numerals. Nowhere has he dealt with the seeming fact that these words, so regarded, always yield perfectly consistent results, and give us a scale of numeration which is thoroughly intelligible and at the same time supported by the vocabularies of existing Turanian dialects. But we are not discussing here either Mr. Taylor's mistakes and blunders, if he has made any, or the keensightedness of his adversary in exposing them. The duty of fairness towards an opponent comes even before the duty of zeal in the search for truth. In fact, without this condition we start in a frame of mind which, to adopt Captain Burton's own phrase, must "vitiate almost every research," if it does not render all research useless. But what are we to say when Captain Burton apparently charges Mr. Taylor with asserting the affinity of Etruscans and Egyptians because both used converging door-jambs (219); whereas in his *Etruscan Researches* (354) Mr. Taylor regards this and other points of likeness as merely accidental? In the same spirit Captain Burton tells us that "the authority of MM. Lenormant, Sayce, Edkins, and Sir Henry Rawlinson is invoked to defend as Turanian or Turkish such familiar Arabic words as *naas*, *jinn*, and *goud*" (221). Mr. Taylor may be right or wrong, but he set down these words as Turanian on the strength

* *Etruscan Bologna: a Study*. By Richard F. Burton. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

of his own reasons, which are carefully given; nor does he invoke their authority to support him in these or in any other instances. He appeals to them only as sanctioning the general hypothesis that there is "a large infusion of genuine Turanian roots into the Semitic and Aryan languages." Again, Mr. Taylor, in his *Researches* (14), speaks of certain customs of the Etruscans as being "unknown among the Aryan races"; Captain Burton seems to think that he has disproved the Turanian kinship of the Etruscans by alleging that these customs are found among other non-Aryan tribes (pp. 216, 220). Mr. Taylor nowhere asserts, or even implies, that they may not be; his argument is strictly confined to proving the non-Aryan character of the Etruscans—a point which it was very necessary to determine at a time when general belief held them to be Aryans. It is ludicrous to maintain that B is C as an argument against the proposition that no B is A.

Our patience, however, is to be still more severely taxed. Mr. Taylor had said (*Researches*, p. 41) that there are reasons for believing that there were temples in some of the Etruscan cities. He had also said (*ibid.* p. 41) that not a vestige remains of a single Etruscan temple or of a single Etruscan palace. Captain Burton places these two sentences in parallel columns (119) in a note, asking first, "What can we make of parallel passages like these?" A little reflection might have taught him that Etruscan temples and palaces were, in Mr. Taylor's belief, not so substantially built as their sepulchres, and that their disappearance was therefore no matter for surprise. But if Captain Burton felt himself really unable to make anything of the passages, he should have said so. He had no right to put his query of uncertainty or puzzlement into a note, and tell us in his text that Mr. Taylor "absolutely asserts the non-existence of Etruscan temples" (119). He must of course impute to Mr. Taylor by these words the opinion that the Etruscans never had any temples; for even he himself allows that none are standing now. He charges him, then, with saying that which he has not said, and professes himself at a loss to understand two sentences which Mr. Taylor explains by the simple fact that temples "played no conspicuous part in the life of the people." But Captain Burton is not content with putting into Mr. Taylor's mouth words which he never uttered. He rushes into a discussion on the temple of Voltumna and the restoration of a building by the Cavaliere Zannoni; and in the course of his remarks he gravely tells us that "Vitruvius represents the epistylia to have been wooden; hence the broader intercolumniations than in the Greek orders, and hence, probably, the reason why none of the temples are standing" (120). Thus, after all, Captain Burton is on this point in absolute agreement with the writer on whom he fastens an absolute denial of the existence of Etruscan temples at any time. After the same fashion Mr. Taylor is represented as asserting that "the mysterious Albanian is simply the vulgar Finnic" (215)—in other words, that the Albanian language is non-Aryan. We turn to the *Etruscan Researches* (20), and we read that "the numerals, the auxiliary verb, the pronouns, and the general grammatical structure prove that the Albanian language belongs to the Aryan class." To adopt Captain Burton's query, what are we to make of such charges as these?

Loftily maintaining that there is no need of slaying the slain, Captain Burton thinks that he has set aside the argument drawn from the character of Etruscan sepulchres, as family tombs, against their Aryan origin, by referring to the tombs of the Kings and the tombs of the prophets near Jerusalem (217); and this singular proof is followed by another charge, which is absolutely contradicted by Mr. Taylor's text. "Even Stonehenge," he is represented as saying, "is a primeval structure of the Turanian type." What Mr. Taylor says of it is simply that it is not primeval at all, but a "curious survival," which "bears witness to the primeval method of interment" (*Researches*, p. 43). This is well nigh enough. But Captain Burton has no hesitation in imputing to Mr. Taylor, not only "absolute ignorance of all Eastern languages" but "an unscrupulous ingenuity" in distorting the names of persons and places (221). We will not imitate Captain Burton by imputing to him anything worse than amazing carelessness in his treatment of an opponent. We certainly do not charge him with ingenuity.

Random hitting must give at least some excuse for the suspicion that either the combatant knows little of his art, or that he has no well-considered plan, or else that he is incapable of forming any plan. The glaring contradiction between Captain Burton's accusations and the passages in Mr. Taylor's text to which those accusations refer would fairly justify us in doubting whether Captain Burton's parade of immense learning may not be something like the lion's skin in the old fable. Speaking of the Etruscan numerals as drawn out by Mr. Taylor, he has the assurance to shelter himself under the authority of Corssen, "perhaps the profoundest Etruscologist of his age," and to adduce his assertion "that of twenty-two numerals which Mr. Taylor has claimed as proofs of the connexion between Etruscan and the Altaic branch of the Turanian family of tongues, as many as eighteen are not even Etruscan, and of the four remaining three are pronouns and one is a proper name" (231). In the note appended to this passage we are told that "Professor Corssen's numerals are Italian." In other words, we must hold that Corssen's numerals are also the numerals of the Etruscans; and if we ask why we should do so, the answer is, because the profoundest Etruscologist of the age has said it. It is difficult in such a case as this to believe the evidence of one's eyes. Mr. Taylor brings forward certain words as Etruscan numerals. Captain Burton asserts on the authority of Corssen that most of

them are not Etruscan words at all, and then gives Corssen's list of numerals—the obvious inference being that this list is right, and that the words of the list are those by which the Etruscans actually made their reckonings. All this we find in pages 230-231; but in the note of page 228 we find that these Latin numerals are not the old Etruscan numerals, and that the attempt of Corssen to prove that they were has ended in "undoubted failure." In truth, we had already quoted this note as expressing Captain Burton's opinion that, "judged by its numerals," "Etruscan has no affinity with any known tongue." We do not ask here what we are to make of such palpable contradictions.

Of the slips or blunders made by Captain Burton in the course of this most unfair attack we might draw out a goodly array. But it is not worth while to do so; nor is it for the sake of exposing ignorance that we say a few words on the note in which he gives the following as Corssen's numerals:—Uni (1), Teis (2), Trinache (3), Chvarthu (4), Cuinte (5), Sesths (6), Setume (7), Untave (8), Nunas (9), Tesne (10), Tesne eka (11), and Tisnteis (20). But in fact Corssen gives eka as well as uni for one, and has chvarth, not chvarthu, for four; untave, not untave, for eight; tesne and tecumal, not tesne, for ten; and tesne teis for twelve, not tisnteis (in one word) for twenty. Now in almost every point in which Captain Burton disagrees with the rendering of Corssen he agrees strictly with the list as given in the *British Quarterly Review*, October 1875, p. 425. Here we have the omission of eka and tecumal, the misprint of chvarthu for chvarth, of tesne for tesne, and of tesnteis (in one word) for tesne teis. But in the *British Quarterly* article tesnteis is not given as the equivalent for twenty. This is an improvement imported by Captain Burton, who seems to have been impressed by the phonetic likeness of the words. Is it possible to avoid the conclusion that Captain Burton has taken the list, not from Corssen, whose attempt to show that these were the Etruscan numerals he sets down as an undoubted failure, but from the article in the *British Quarterly*? A writer who does his work in this fashion should be careful how he charges another, as Captain Burton charges Mr. Taylor, with disingenuousness and dishonesty.

WATER-COLOUR PAINTINGS IN SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM.*

THE ground of which this descriptive and illustrated Catalogue seeks to take possession has been pretty thoroughly worked out before. The rise and maturity of the art of painting in water-colours in England is a theme far too congenial to our national pride to have been neglected till now. Yet the present volume may fairly claim the merit of bringing together scattered materials, and of condensing into a pleasant epitome a history which might easily be prolonged into tediousness. "The Introductory Notice," which extends to sixty-seven pages, begins with a brief account of the origin of "the historic collection" in the South Kensington Museum, and closes in a Cassandra strain with a review of the "present state of the art." The following ending, which is not an unfair sample of what goes before, can scarcely be commended for closeness of thought, terseness of diction, or for even a right understanding of the historic evidence. The late Mr. Samuel Redgrave, with the assistance of his brother, Mr. Richard Redgrave, damns with something more damaging than faint praise "the general aspect of our exhibitions." It will be observed that the paragraph opens with a long and involved sentence, truly typical of the literary style of "the department" which presumes to dispense "art and science" among the people. The involutions may recall those Acts of Parliament through the midst of which it was the boast of Daniel O'Connell that he could drive a coach and four:—

In fact [concludes Mr. Samuel Redgrave], the general aspect of our exhibitions, as distinct from our examination of individual works, is certainly more grey and husky than formerly; we seem to look "on to" the pictures, rather than "into" them; to see the surface, as it were, intercepting the depths [this is good]: added to which, as has been already said, the use of opaque white grows on the artist, and it would be easy, were it right to do so, to point to those who, beginning to use it delicately and with *finesse*, have ended in revelling in its abuse. It is, therefore, earnestly to be hoped that the art as practised by Turner, Girtin, Cox, and De Wint at his best period, may still find some loving and true followers, and that those who are now using white with taste will treat it with reserve as a dangerous ally or treacherous friend.

We will not debate in the abstract the oft-disputed point touching the use and abuse of opaque, as distinguished from transparent colours. We may, however, just observe that the line of demarcation is not absolute; opaque pigments may be used translucently, while transparent colours are occasionally loaded on with a bodily substance which approaches opacity. The practice of the majority of masters proves that the highest excellence lies in a just balance, that in the apposition of the two methods the art develops its manifold resources. Thus the wholesale denunciation of "opaque" may be cast aside among obsolete prejudices. The prevailing opinion, as well as the best practice, looks upon paints and other vehicles as mainly the means for getting at desired ends. The rule, then, to be laid down is little else than the apparent truism that it is lawful to use opaque colour whenever it will attain the desired effect better than transparent pigments.

The fallacy we have endeavoured to refute is in some measure

* A Descriptive Catalogue of the Historical Collection of Water-Colour Paintings in South Kensington Museum. With an Introductory Notice by Samuel Redgrave. Published for the Science and Art Department of the Committee of Council on Education. Chapman & Hall. 1877.

incident to the misinterpretation of the history which Mr. Redgrave recounts. It has been too much the habit of writers to narrow a world-wide manifestation into a local episode, and then to magnify the episode until it usurps a large circuit of the historic horizon. It pleases Mr. Redgrave and others to point to certain topographical and architectural limners who practised a poverty-stricken art of washing, staining, and tinting paper as the originators of a school which is tacitly assumed to be all but exclusively English; whereas undoubted facts, which these writers do not venture to disguise, establish the existence of divers modes of water-colour painting from almost prehistoric times, over a large surface of the civilized world. The fact is, that to liquefy paints in water is the most obvious of all expedients; and the use of oil as a medium, though now referred back to a period prior to the Van Eycks, is a comparatively modern method. We object, then, to look upon what is called our emphatically national art in isolation; it is an integral part of a wide-sweeping manifestation which comprises the wall-paintings on the Nile and the Euphrates, the tempera panel-pictures of Italy, the miniature portraits of England and other countries, the illuminated missals and manuscripts of Christendom, no less than the drawings on paper by De Wint, Copley Fielding, Turner, and William Hunt. We need not stop to meet the possible objection that in tempera or distemper white of egg or other gelatinous mediums were employed, because the answer is obvious, that water-colour pigments in England have always been prepared with something more than water; an adhesive mixture is needed to bind the crumbling atoms of paint together. The number of mediums or admixtures which have been, or may possibly be, used—ranging from white of egg, gum, honey, and sugar, to *wasser-glas*—is little short of infinite; and so varied are these vehicles, both in essence and operation, that the strict line of demarcation between water and oil is sometimes merged. We have often heard of lost methods; it was once the fashion to talk of fresco-painting as “one of the lost arts,” whereas the mystery (*il misterio*), whether “puro” or “secco,” has never been extinct in Italy. And so it is with the whole genus of water-colour painting; it has never died out. In some one country, or at some one time, it may have fallen into partial or temporary disuse; but such abeyance is usually followed, as in England, by periods of revival, and the new birth is commonly not an absolutely fresh creation, but an altered phase of the old form.

The preceding considerations lead to the conclusion already indicated—that, in the history of art, opacity is the rule and transparency the exception. We in no way wish to undervalue the high quality of purely transparent drawings, of which there are some choice examples at South Kensington; at the same time we claim something more than indulgence for the large class of painters who, in accordance with the precedents of past ages, seek for power, detail, and realism in pigments which approach the bodily substance of actual objects in nature. There is no pretence for saying that a brick wall, a besom, and a brass kettle, the delight of the Dutch school, are transparent; neither is it correct to assert that opaque colours cannot be atmospheric; on the contrary, some of the most aerial skies we have ever seen admit the admixture of flake white. The rule used to be, and still is, keep your shadows transparent, and load on with opaque the high lights. The force of this maxim, which prevails scarcely less in water-colours than in oils, is strikingly illustrated by the diamond ring on the hand of Wallenstein in the famous picture by Piloty in the New Pinakothek at Munich. A spot of white paint is here placed in sharp relief, as if it were the diamond itself, and a glittering light scintillating from the raised surface illumines the surrounding gloom.

Within the last twenty years we have known of three attempts, each more or less successful, to form an historic collection of water-colour drawings. The first, and perhaps the best, was that in the Manchester Art Treasures of 1857. The exhibition numbered no less than 965 works. Of Turner alone there were present more than eighty examples; and other masters, such as Paul Sandby, Thomas Girtin, Barrett, De Wint, Müller, Fielding, Cattermole, Cox, William Hunt, Lewis, Roberts, Stanfield, and Frederick Taylor, were illustrated with scarcely less liberality. A short introduction in the Catalogue assigns to the art “the highest antiquity,” and includes among its manifestations “fresco-painting as practised in Italy,” and “missals and other books in the middle ages.” It is further truly stated that, “among other masters of a succeeding period, Albert Dürer has left us several examples of water-colour painting in the shape of detached studies.” A choice collection of such studies is now to be seen on the walls of the Burlington Fine Arts Club. In accordance with this more extended view, the Manchester treasures comprised specimens of Rembrandt, Ostade, Van Huysum, and Watteau. Of the last master there are also examples in the Burlington Club. The second deliberate effort to illustrate the history of the art was made by that Club in 1871. The representative drawings selected were not much over one quarter of the number in Manchester. The idea emphasized seems to have been the same as that worked out by Mr. Redgrave. We are told that this peculiarly “British branch of the Fine Arts” “has drawn neither its models nor its principles from any foreign source; home bred and fostered, it owes its perfection to Englishmen alone.” As to the claims of “Englishmen alone,” we may point to foreigners such as Mlle. Rosa Bonheur, and the great Belgian painter, M. Madou, drawings by whom, when exhibited in the “Institute,” Pall Mall, created no slight commotion among artists and connoisseurs. We may also call to mind that Mr. Carl Hasg and M.

Lundgren, of the Old Water Colour Society, and Mr. Louis Haghe, Herr Carl Werner, and Herr Guido Bach, in the Institute—not to name others—are all importations from the Continent. We would likewise refer to the Catalogues of the Paris Salon to prove that France, while succeeding pre-eminently in charcoal-drawing and etching, does not deny herself the practice of water-colour painting. Further, we may call attention to the “Société Belge des Aquarellistes,” of the existence of which English compilers of catalogues would appear to be uninformed. The tenth annual exhibition of this Society, held in Brussels in 1868, and “organisée avec le concours et sous le patronage du gouvernement,” we happen to have visited. The collection was truly cosmopolitan, comprising close upon three hundred drawings, coming from Belgium, Holland, France, Germany, Italy, England, and America, and including such well-known names as MM. Madou, Bisschop, Hamman, Israels, Roelofs, Ten Kate, Van Lerius, and other artists of the Continent scarcely less well accredited. We need make no apology for disabusing the English mind of the fondly cherished notion that this deservedly extolled art is exclusively “home-bred.”

The third and latest historic collection is that now formed at South Kensington; the examples within the Museum exceed five hundred, and the artists present reach nearly three hundred; amateurs are not excluded, and thus the Rev. Thomas Raven and Viscountess Templetown serve to fill up blank spaces. The collection has the merit of being open to augmentation; further bequests are solicited, while ready money is afforded for purchases. The donors include Mr. Sheepshanks, Mrs. Ellison, the Rev. C. H. Townshend, and Mr. William Smith. One of the earliest specimens is “The Old East India Wharf,” by Monamy (No. 644), painted prior to 1749. Strange to say, no attempt is made to accomplish a chronological arrangement. The Catalogue, like others in the same series, is illustrated; but these chromo-lithographs fail in common with those which also bear the name of Mr. Vincent Brooks in the publications of the Arundel Society—they are marred by crudity of colour. The best is “The Boat on the Beach,” after J. S. Cotman. We may here take occasion to remark that we were recently within these galleries at lighting-up time, and we regret to add that the potency of the illumination was appreciable no less by the nose than by the eye. In the upper galleries, reserved specially for the pictorial arts, including Raffaele’s “Cartoons,” the escape of gas and the fumes from its consumption might easily have proved fatal to asthmatic sufferers. We should as soon trust a delicate and perishable work of art to the atmosphere of a tunnel on the Metropolitan Railway as to the peculiar compound brewed in “The Brompton Boilers.” In some measure the drawings receive protection under glass, and the oil pictures lent by Earl Spencer and others are rendered unassailable by the impervious covering of dirt; but still, among persons competent to judge, the conviction has long prevailed that the property of the nation and of private collectors is put in great peril by the night exhibitions of the “Department.”

This Descriptive Catalogue is of the nature of a posthumous work. We are told that “the manuscript was compiled and a considerable portion was in type” when its author, Mr. Samuel Redgrave, died in March of last year. We are also informed that his brother, Mr. Richard Redgrave, who had “rendered valuable assistance” in the compilation of the work, supervised its publication. It is not the first, though it now must be the last time, that the two brothers have joined hands in literary labours which the world has learnt to look upon kindly. *A Century of Painters of the English School*, by these genial authors, devotes a couple of instructive chapters to water-colour art, artists, and societies. The brothers Redgrave have been fortunate in their surroundings; like Vasari, they have penned their narratives while the dead whose deeds they celebrate yet live in the memory of survivors, and in some instances they have been actually fellow-workers with the painters conspicuous in the annals of the “Century.” They write upon themes which lie near to their heart, and though scarcely pretending to a literary style, and though their accents occasionally sound timorous, yet they win a hearing by unassuming simplicity, and gather strength in the bold maintenance of truth. Their sympathies are warm, and the reputation of the artist is safe in their hands.

BY THE ELBE.*

IT is difficult to characterize this book. A novel presupposes some kind of human interest in the plot, and some kind of naturalness in the characters, the setting of the scenes, the conversations, and the events. It also presupposes a certain amount of life and movement in the story, which should be carried on from chapter to chapter by natural sequence, so that the reader should wish to know what is coming next, being already interested in what has gone before. Moreover, in any case the reader has the right to demand fairly accurate grammar and a style of composition which shall not shock all his perceptions of grace and euphony. *By the Elbe* fulfils none of these conditions. The liveliness of the story may be estimated when we say that it takes the first twenty pages to describe, or rather to enumerate, all the things and places which the heroine, Mary Carteret, is about to leave in quitting her old home; and that it takes a hundred and seventy-five pages (and closely printed pages

* *By the Elbe*. By Sarah Tytler, Author of “*Citoyenne Jacqueline*,” &c. 3 vols. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1876.

too) to detail the following not very wonderful circumstances—namely, the arrival of Mrs. Carteret's friend, Mrs. Penfeather; the flying visit of a young man and the future hero, Taff Penryn; Mary's visit to Kit Must, her father's bailiff, to look over the accounts; and the final arrival of the Carteret family, without adventures, at their temporary home in Dresden. There is no glimpse up to this point of plot or story, or of any foregone event having important results; the whole thing is now a long-winded dissertation on women's rights and uses, in the form of dialogue and reflection, and now a pretentious but superficial account of things and places seen by the Carterets on their way to, and during their stay in, Dresden and elsewhere.

If the story is dull and the characters uninteresting, the language of the book is original, to say the least of it. The dedication itself is singular. "The youthful courage and cheerfulness which lightened many a long day's journey and queer halting-place" reads oddly; but then many of Miss Tytler's sentences read oddly, and some of her words and uses of words are decidedly not to be found in any ordinary dictionary. "Mrs. Carteret in her spirit of conservatism and well-bred housewifery, so took order," is a curious phrase; "Mrs. Carteret had doggedly refused becoming the principal party" is worse than awkward; and where has the author learnt that "bulk" is a verb? The following extract is a fair example of the lumbering and congested style in which *By the Elbe* is written:—

It was Mrs. Penfeather's regret and annoyance at having been the unwitting means of placing herself and others in an awkward position, and her determination of purpose, which produced a modification in the arrangements. Mrs. Penfeather lodged in the little school-house in the neighbouring village of Cleve, and only walked up to dinner at "The Warren," in place of being a resident in the house.

Mrs. Penfeather had now come to dinner, and was being of what use she could to her hostess. She was sitting in her best black silk and Indian shawl to show that she treated the occasion with due honour. She was probably diverting Mrs. Carteret's mind from those cares of which she complained, or at least lessening their burden by becoming their recipient, even while Mrs. Penfeather entered her private protest of the inequality which had been established between the women, and therefore of her incapacity to fill again, as satisfactorily as formerly, the long vacated post of her friend's confidante.

As for Mrs. Carteret, she was not disturbed by any doubts of Mrs. Penfeather's comprehension of and concern for her trials. She was one of those women whose private experiences bulk so largely in their minds, that the notes in their own eyes monopolise the faculties of vision, and they cannot so much as see the beams barring their neighbours' eyes.

In another place Miss Tytler uses "suborn" apparently in the sense of "spoil," as where Mrs. Penfeather says of Mr. Carteret's management of his daughter, "He is content with having suborned Mary; and very likely she is an eccentric, aggressive, disagreeable young woman, amply warranting her mother's lamentations." That mother herself speaks of her husband's dealings with their sons thus:—"He would have had them men before they were major," which is an eccentric expression not at all likely to be used by such a person as Mrs. Carteret. What is meant by "When the rebellion broke out at other stations in India I left our own compost"? Did Mrs. Penfeather sit guardian over a heap of farm-dressing, or did she mean "compound" when she wrote "compost"? "In Italy and France, afterwards, when there was less excuse for it, I have been called in by the village landlord of an *osteria* and an *auberge* to settle a dispute," means, if it means anything, that the landlord of an *osteria* and an *auberge* was one and the same person living now in Italy and now in France. "She could not see that the Palestine Exploration or the Arctic Expedition were (*sic*) anything save a waste of life and property." "It might have been erected, and probably, though the place was not above thirty years old, some of the rooms had been used for a barn and granary, so spacious were they in their own homely way." "Still Mary protested that the space was a great deal in itself, in order to feel not like a crow in the mist—she did not admit that—or an inhabitant of the long, chill, bare common room of a workhouse or penitentiary, but rather like a free independent member of society, who could busy herself with her own occupations and think her own thoughts within the same four walls as the others, and yet be out of earshot of them." These are a few instances, taken at random, of what Miss Tytler has sent forth to the world as accurate and readable English. The last two sentences indeed are hopeless.

The conversations are on a par with the author's own style. Is this the kind of thing which a by no means intellectual woman would say to a young man at their first chance interview?—

"And then you must take into account," said Mrs. Penfeather, "the great safeguard to German pondering and mysticism which is to be found in habits of absolute truthfulness and faithful accuracy of observation, together with patient following of side influences to their proper results. If German students do not actually attain the goals aimed at, they do very often, whether they stop short or no, pick up pearls by the way. Don't you remember that the shutting up of a philosopher in the old castle of Meissen with what we now judge the foolishly unprofitable intent of forcing him to devote his whole energies to finding the philosopher's stone, was the primary cause of the production of that Dresden china which has proved a valuable aid to the Saxon exchequer, and a source of delight to people of taste and culture to this day?"

And does this method of telling things—necessary perhaps on the stage—read like life in a novel?—

"Let me go," said Mary boldly; "I have been far oftener at Sanford with papa than either Regy or Tom ever was. I know very nearly how everything—fields and animals—should look at this season; I have written down Kit Must's accounts from his hieroglyphics and from his dictation during the autumn when papa's wrist was sprained. You said, papa, that the accounts were fairly written out. You suffered me to add them up also,

and you were satisfied with the arithmetic. I am not a bad clerk and accountant for a girl—you have owned that—thanks to my having the benefit of the boys' tutor before they went to school, and to my first governess's having had the ambition to share in the work of a preparatory boys' school kept by her brother, a seventh wrangler."

Mrs. Penfeather, again, indulges in this description of farmyard noises which we venture to think no sane person would have uttered:—

"Now hush, Mary," said Mrs. Penfeather; "I do not say that you are not speaking the truth. But you have spoken quite enough treason for one night, and you have disturbed me in listening, in the quietness that may be felt here, to a peculiar serenade. All the farm-house noises—the clucking and gobbling of late hens, geese, and ducks, the lowing of calves demanding to be fed, the jingling of bridles, the stamping of hoofs, and the voices of workpeople returning from their day's work—have ceased, one by one, hours ago. A little breeze has risen, and there is an audible accompaniment to my thoughts. It is not like the monotonous break of the waves in all kinds of weather, at the full height of the tide, on the shore; neither is it like the continued cracking, swinging, and swishing of trees in a wood, even in an incipient storm; it is a fitful and yet often-repeated rustling, like the stirring of angels' wings all around us."

"It is the night wind coming and going among the corn," said Mary.

To "shake a mother's incredulity in the incapacity" of her sons is at the best an awkward conjunction of negations. "His eyes had a sunk look in cheeks the brick red firmness of which had become streaked with purple and flabby in flesh," is another instance of the author's extraordinary taste in the delicacies of style; and the description of Mary is on a par with the rest:—

In spite of it there was no mean closeness in Mary Carteret's mouth, or rigid narrowness in her forehead, or elongated claw-like type in her hands, to indicate her, betimes, a miser; at four-and-twenty years of age, in the first prime of womanhood, her comeliness was remarkable for its breadth and openness. She had a wide forehead, eyes set well apart, a nose slightly too broad for symmetry, and a mouth whose red flexible lips were not small. Her very wealth of healthy, slightly tanned colour, reddening the pale, creamy whiteness of the rest of the skin, which it invaded, with the abundance and nut-like gloss and tint of her twisted brown hair, under her flapping Leghorn hat, were all opposed to niggardliness of constitution and temperament. Her stature, as she stood there in her Holland gown, was not low, her gait was not wavering or crafty, far less cringing. There appeared to be nothing stunted or starved about the woman, not even anything of the disproportions that so often meet the view. She had somehow attained to her full height, however tender or raw the structure might otherwise be, in mind and body. Although she was a lady by descent and education—so perfectly a lady that her ladyhood was innate and unconscious—a certain seriousness, independence, and vigour in her air, opposed to the restrictions and helplessness of many of her class, reminded an observer of a good and true, brave and earnest peasant woman.

With such a clumsy and entangled style as this, the story, to be good for anything, needed to have been one of exceeding interest and vitality. On the contrary, *By the Elbe* is totally lacking in both. So far as we can make out, Mr. Carteret has managed his affairs so badly that he is obliged to shut up "the Warren" and live abroad. That he does not try to let his house is of a piece with the inanity and improbability of all the rest. At Dresden he is horribly bored and grows visibly older; "his iron-grey hair seemed to whiten daily; the change on the fresh colour of his prime to the mottled and streaked purple-red of an aging man became always more conspicuous; his bulk hung more loosely and heavily upon him, until he took to using a stick in good earnest when he walked out, while his broad shoulders grew daily rounder and rounder." Nevertheless he not only rode regularly, but skated, played rackets and billiards, and "danced with his daughters of an evening." This is about as good physiology as the talk about "poppies, oxeyed (*sic*) daisies, corn-cockles and corn-marigolds"—"unapproachable flowers," as Miss Tytler calls them, growing up "of their own sweet will" in spite of high farming—is good botany for the month when the laburnum is in blossom. Mixed up with the Carteret family are certain German personages, of whom the strangest seems to be a "mad Graf," who drives a four-in-hand, sits in a clumsy chair drinking Bavarian beer at the windows of the commonest beershops, and throws to actresses and singers bouquets with jewels in their "hearts." He and Taff Penryn both fall in love with Mary; but the latter is the favoured suitor, and, after a due amount of difficulty, wins the day, while the mad Graf consoles himself elsewhere. Then there are Baronesses and Fraus, Herrs and Fräuleins, with a few English to lighten the mass; but as the main purpose of the book seems to be to describe foreign scenes and places, and to display a little knowledge which is but skin-deep anywhere, the story, which is exceedingly slight though the work is fearfully long, and the characters, which are thoroughly uninteresting, suffer equally at Miss Tytler's hands. Such story as there is might have been given in less than half a volume, with space to spare; and when five-sixths of a work is simple padding, it is impossible not to regard the whole thing as a mistake, and a loss of time to all concerned.

CHAUCER FOR CHILDREN.*

THE good fortune of the children of this generation is certainly not on the wane. Every department of knowledge is laid open to them in Primers and Epochs; their very valentines are a marvel of pre-Raphaelite green and gold; the stories and the poems that are written for them have long outgrown the homely simplicity of Mrs. Trimmer and Mrs. Sherwood. If M.

* *Chaucer for Children: a Golden Key.* By Mrs. H. E. Haweis. Illustrated with Eight Coloured Pictures and numerous Woodcuts by the Author. London: Chatto & Windus. 1876.

Guizot wishes to tell the History of France from the beginning, he tells it "to his grandchildren"; if Dr. Hooker desires to write a system; an account of botany, he writes it for the lower forms. And if history and science are to be thus revealed to babes, so must it be with literature. There is no reason, say the energetic modern educators, why the treasures of the human spirit should not be shown as openly to infancy as the treasures of nature or the glories of human action. In a spirit something like this, Charles Lamb and his sister wrote their *Tales from Shakespeare*; and now comes Mrs. Haweis with a bold and deliberate attempt to bring Chaucer himself, the difficult and remote—Chaucer himself, his very words and not his stories only—down to the comprehension of "my little Lionel." And it must be admitted that her attempt is both justifiable and in the main successful. Difficult as Chaucer may seem at first sight, his difficulty is mainly an affair of language that is easily got over. In point of matter he is the plainest and the most direct of story-tellers; his plots are worked out with few characters, simple and transparent folk for the most part; the passions that he sets in motion are the elementary passions of humanity which no "pale cast of thought" has yet made dim. May it not even be said that the children of every age will always take pleasure in the childhood of the world? In a sense, the men and women of Chaucer's world and of his poetry are children, obedient to the emotions of the moment, ready to laugh or to weep, strangers to reflection and the "modern malady of thinking." What a child is Constance drifting in her boat, and Palamon quarrelling with his heart's best brother for a toy that is within the reach of neither! What children are the pilgrims whose journey through four long days is made pleasant by such stories! Strip the pilgrims' language of its difficulties, and you at once have a world in which a modern child can move freely and with understanding. This is precisely what Mrs. Haweis proposes to do by means of her "golden key." She hopes, by dint of a few simple instructions about pronunciation, and of parallel versions of the stories in modern English (rather by way of reference and explanation than as a substitute), to put it in the power of any mother to teach her child to enjoy Chaucer's story-telling. None can deny that the idea is ingenious; and, moreover, it is worked out with a degree of care that is most praiseworthy. It is a pleasant sign of the times that a book written for children by a lady should be constructed almost as carefully as if it had been written by a professor for his class. Not that it is pedantic or dull; only that Mrs. Haweis has gone to the best authorities, to the Chaucer Society, to half a dozen editions of her poet, to Barbazan and Le Grand, for her text and notes, and most of all to contemporary illuminations for her pictures of costume. So that, if a child takes his notion of the fourteenth century from this book, there is at least no danger of his having to unlearn it again.

The book begins with a preface of half a dozen pages addressed to the mother, giving a few simple rules of rhythm and accent by which Chaucer may be read aloud intelligibly to children, "whose crude language is in many ways the counterpart" of his. The great point to remember is that

Chaucer is always *rhythmical*. Hardly ever is his rhythm a shade wrong, and therefore, roughly speaking, if you pronounce the words so as to preserve the rhythm, all will be well. When the final must be sounded so as to make the rhythm right, sound it, but where it is not needed leave it mute.

This is the rough rule for the rhythm; as to the sound, it is of course not so easy to generalize. Mrs. Haweis adopts the results of the researches of Mr. A. J. Ellis (who, with Mr. Furnivall and others, has helped her in her work), and gives specimen passages by which the reader may guide his pronunciation. Here are the well-known opening lines of the Prologue, as Chaucer's contemporaries would have read them:—

When that Aprilla with his schocērs sohta
The drokht of March hath paired to the rohta,
And bathed ev'ry vin in sweech licōr,
Of which vairtū enjendred is the flour;
Whan Zephirōs aik with his swaita braitha
Enspeerd hath in ev'ry holt and haiha
'He tendra croppes, and the yōonga sōōna
Hath in the Ram his halfa cōōrs i-rōōna,
And smahla fōōles mahken melodee-a,
That slaipein al the nikht with ohpen eo-a,
So pricketh hem nahtūr in heer corāges, &c.

Strange as the verses look when printed in this way, it is astonishing how *natural* Chaucer sounds when we read him with the accent that Mr. Ellis has found again for us; and it is a great gain that the writer of a book meant for popular use should try to make such discoveries generally known. In the same way, in the account of Chaucer's life which follows, Mrs. Haweis does her best to embody both the new discoveries of the Chaucer Society and whatever Mr. Wright and Sir S. Meyrick and Paul Lacroix have to tell about manners and customs, dwellings and costumes. Two maps placed on the same page show the contrast between the small meadow-set London of the fifteenth century and the fraction of modern London which more than covers the same space. Chaucer's portrait, copied on steel from the famous drawing of Occleve, fills one page; large coloured pictures of a dinner in Chaucer's day, and an old street-scene, little woodcuts of the poet's hood with its "liripipe," of his wife's crown-like head-dress, of the board from which he ate, of the ship in which he sailed, give reality to the biography. As to the life itself, Mrs. Haweis cannot of course make bricks without straw. Chaucer shared the fate of all the poets of an early day; history took no note of him while he lived, and posterity must search and search before even a few stray facts can be known of his birth and marriage and death. Such as the

facts are, however, here we have them, and they are told in a pleasant way, considering that almost all the extant records of Chaucer's life are records of moneys received by him. To our mind Mrs. Haweis is a little too Lancastrian in tone, and makes too much of the friendship between the poet and his patron. But we quite go with her in holding to the old belief as to Chaucer's marriage, against the scepticism of Dr. Morris. We believe the evidence that Philippa Chaucer was originally Philippa Roët, sister to John of Gaunt's last wife, to be overpowering, and to consist not in arguments from heraldry alone. We believe that Thomas Chaucer, who adopted the arms of Roët, "*Gules, three Catherine wheels or,*" who was Speaker of the House of Commons in 1414, and Envoy to the French King after Agincourt; and whose daughter was, by her third husband William de la Pole, grandmother of that John Earl of Lincoln whom Richard III. named as conditional heir to the throne—we believe that this very Thomas Chaucer was the poet's son. At least, in the face of the great attractiveness of that supposition, we require much stronger evidence on the sceptical side than Dr. Morris or any one else has yet brought forward.

The greater part of the book is taken up with a selection from the *Canterbury Tales*, a very few of the minor poems being brought in at the end. The Prologue, which is enlivened by capital woodcuts of the pilgrims in their exact costume, is given at length, partly in Chaucer's words, with their modern equivalents printed opposite, and partly in prose paraphrase. The same method is followed throughout the Tales, of which we have the Knight's, Clerk's, Franklin's, and Pardoner's. We might find a good deal of fault with this selection if we were so disposed; for example, to introduce the Friar's Tale, a story of low cunning and ugly depravity at best, however much you soften the language, must be called an offence against the reverence due to children. And the Franklin's Tale, again, the story of Dorigen and Aurelius, although Mrs. Haweis succeeds in disguising the details, has—what shall we say?—an element of the modern French novel in it which should perhaps be kept out of the way of inquisitive precocity rather than suggested to it. When it was possible to have told the lovely story of Constance from the Man of Law's Tale, we can hardly understand why Mrs. Haweis should have preferred the Franklin's; just as we cannot understand why she left out the Nun's Priest's Tale, with its immortal Chanticleer and Partlet and Reynard, to give us the gruesome dialogue of the Summoner and the Yeoman. Still, when all is said, the stories are well reproduced, and we are content to dwell upon the pleasant ones—on the matchless history of Palamon and Arcite, and on the loves of the hapless Griselda. Children are always excited by stories of hard words and hard blows, and they understand—none better—the possibility of quarrels between friends. Hence Palamon and Arcite are intelligible to them, though they may only faintly apprehend the motive of the cousins' strife. They like, too, to be told of injured innocence set right in the end; and therefore Griselda will always be a favourite, a fact which we confess to having put to the test with a very young child.

The real novelty of this book consists in the illustrations, and in the modernized versions which Mrs. Haweis prints parallel with Chaucer's own words. As we have already said, the pictures have at least the merit of being accurately studied, and for the small woodcuts we have nothing but praise. The large coloured pictures are artistically not so satisfactory; and that of Griselda when she is being robbed of her child is a positive failure. Much better is "The Rioter," a really imaginative rendering of the dissipated and cruel young man, who is returning from his errand of death with the wine-jars strapped on his shoulder. As to the poetical versions, Mrs. Haweis has shown that it is, after all, neither impossible nor difficult to "modernize" Chaucer without rewriting him in the style of Dryden. As one turns from the simple, spontaneous flow of the Knight's Tale to the sonorous rhetoric of Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite*, one feels as one feels in reading Pope after Homer—it is magnificent, but it is not translation. The versions of Mrs. Haweis are perhaps not magnificent, but they are translations; in fact, they are the originals with a very minimum of alteration. Here, for instance, is part of Chaucer's description of "Emetreus, the kyng of Ynde":—

His nose was heigh, his eyen bright cytryn,
His lippes rounde, his colour was sangwyn,
A fewe freknes in his face y-spreynd,
Betwixe yolve and somdel blak y-meynd,
And as a lyoun he his lokyng caste.
Of fyve and twenty yeer his age I caste.
His berd was wel bygonne for to sprynge;
His voys was as a trumpe thunderynge.
Upon his heed he wored of laurer grene
A garland freische and lusty for to sene.

Dryden's rendering of these lines is far better known than the original; and yet what an audacious rendering it is:—

His nose was aquiline, his eyes were blue,
Ruddy his lips, and fresh and fair his hue;
Some sprinkled freckles on his face were seen,
Whose dusk set off the whiteness of the skin.
His awful presence did the crowd surprise,
Nor durst the rash spectator meet his eyes;
Eyes that confest him born for kingly sway,
So fierce, they flashed intolerable day.
His age in nature's youthful prime appeared,
And just began to bloom his yellow beard.
When'er he spoke, his voice was heard around,
Loud as a trumpet, with a silver sound.
A laurel wreath'd his temples, fresh and green,
And myrtle sprigs, the marks of love, were mixed between.

All the lines in italics are "improvements" upon Chaucer; and what has become of the real Emetrius among them? what has become of the Homeric directness of his description—

As a lyoun he his loking caste?

Mrs. Haweis, by endeavouring in all simplicity to follow her master without improving him, shows us how little is really required to preserve the very essence of Chaucer, and even his rhythm, in modern English:—

His nose was high, his eyes were bright citrine,
His lips were round, his colour was sanguine,
With a few freckles scattered here and there,
Twixt black and yellow mingling they were,
And, lion-like, his glance went to and fro.
His age was five-and-twenty years, I trow.
A downy beard had just begun to spring;
His voice was like a trumpet thundering.
Upon his head he wore a garland green,
Of laurel, fresh and pleasant to be seen.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

THE administration and public life of Turgot have often been discussed by celebrated writers, but never so fully as in the volume for which we are indebted to M. Foncin.* This biography is, in fact, a complete history of the reforms attempted during the reign of Louis XVI., and of the resistance they encountered from the blind supporters of the *ancien régime* with all its abuses. M. Foncin begins with an introduction describing Turgot's character and appearance in 1774, when, at the age of forty-seven, he was summoned from the *intendance* of Limoges to a place in the Cabinet; he shows him studying law, literature, and even divinity; reading the *Augustinus* of Bishop Jansen, and at the same time selecting his friends from among the leading representatives of what was then called the "philosophical" school. The political and administrative acts of Turgot are related in detail by M. Foncin, and illustrated by reference either to State papers or to works already published on this important period in the reign of Louis XVI.; and in conclusion our author summarizes his narrative and endeavours to answer the two following questions:—1. Was Turgot personally capable of carrying out his projected reforms, or was it his own fault that he failed? 2. If Turgot had been countenanced and supported by a more resolute monarch, could he have succeeded in preventing the Revolution? On the former point M. Foncin remarks that Turgot had all the qualities of a true statesman, except perhaps an accurate knowledge of character, and that his failure must be ascribed not to himself, but to the perseverance and the tactics of his adversaries. As for the latter query, we need only say, with M. Foncin, that it opens the way to suppositions of every kind; in the then state of France a "resolute monarch" might mean either a Joseph II., or a Richelieu, or a Gustavus III., or a Frederick the Great—that is to say, a sovereign rising independently of all Parliamentary control, and managing to stave off for a short season an inevitable catastrophe. The divorce between the Crown and the nation dated from Richelieu; it was rendered public in 1789.

M. Auguste Himly, Professor of Geography at the Sorbonne, has just brought out, in two octavo volumes, the first instalment of a very learned and valuable work.† The plan of his treatise may be briefly explained as follows. The territorial system of Europe at the present time is the result of a long series of revolutions, which, by alternately creating and destroying States, modifying their limits and their relations to their neighbours, have ultimately produced the political map which now exists. Three causes have contributed to this result—the natural configuration of the various countries; the differences of race and nationality; and, finally, the historical influences arising from wars and treaties, dynastic alliances, conquests, &c. The plan adopted by M. Himly in the preparation of his work tallies exactly with the different headings we have just indicated; he traces back the formation of every State to its origin, examining how it has been modified geographically, ethnologically, and historically, and going more or less into details according as he deals with remote or with recent times. We may enumerate briefly the contents of the first two volumes. A description of the physical features of Europe occupies a preliminary book; next comes the historical part of the work, beginning with the conquest of Germany by the Romans, and ending with the Franco-Prussian war; Book III., concluding the first volume, is taken up with the Austrian Empire. Prussia, the smaller States of Germany, Switzerland, and, finally, the Netherlands supply the contents of the second volume. M. Himly has given in his preface a list of the authorities consulted by him, and the tables added for purposes of reference are so copious that they would form an excellent syllabus of a course of lectures.

Whilst M. Himly's work deals mainly with contemporary history, the elegant octavo published by M. Ernest Desjardins‡ is a work of erudition. The first volume, lately issued, is only the introductory part of a treatise which, when finished, will give the geography of Gaul under the Romans, together with the formation and organization of the provinces. It is meant to describe the administration of each province separately from the various points of view of political, civil, military, financial, and religious life; it

will explain the division of the provinces into cities, and of the cities into *pagi*, dwelling fully upon the municipal administration, and indicating the changes which took place during the four centuries of Roman rule. One of the best parts of M. Desjardins's volume is the section devoted to an enumeration of the sources from which he has drawn his narrative; it is an excellent bibliographical summary, which archaeologists cannot consult without profit. Physical geography alone has supplied the materials worked out in this volume; pictorial illustrations in the shape of coloured maps and woodcuts are plentifully added, and footnotes appear in almost every page, bristling with quotations from classical authors, inscriptions, coins, &c.

Some journals have found fault with M. Vapereau's new literary Dictionary.* It would be surprising indeed if a compilation undertaken on so large a scale did not contain blunders, and the wonder is that these blunders should be neither more numerous nor more startling than they are. The learned editor will no doubt turn to profit the corrections suggested by his critics; at the same time we must acknowledge that to our mind few dictionaries are so admirable both in their plan and in their execution. M. Vapereau has combined in one work the information given by treatises on *belles-lettres*, biographies of authors, and histories of literature. From the old *chansons de geste* to the modern burlesque, every style of composition is defined and analysed; from Homer to Theodore Hook, every writer has his notice, and under the heading "Jane Grey," for instance, we have a list of the tragedies, novels, or poems of which she is the heroine.

M. Philartète Charles has devoted much attention to the literature of the sixteenth century; and his ingenious essays on the subject now appear in a revised form †, introduced by a disquisition on the transmission of books and MSS. before and after the invention of printing. He then describes briefly the authors, such as Villon, Charles d'Orléans, and Philippe de Commines, who may be looked upon as the connecting links between the middle ages and the Renaissance; he sketches the various episodes of the war carried on against the *esprit gaulois* by the blind enthusiasts of classical literature, and shows us Malherbe and Regnier holding a happy medium equally opposed to the exaggerations of the Hellenist school and the obstinate champions of mediæval forms and traditions. The next chapter, devoted to a critical estimate of Jacques Auguste de Thou, is the reprint of a monograph which shared with M. Paton's learned essay the prize awarded forty years ago by the Académie Française. The Reformation and the League, Nostradamus and Brantôme, are then examined in succession, and the volume ends with a chapter on philology in which the reader will find ingenious details and suggestive remarks attractively grouped together.

The name of M. Bardoux is new to us, and the present volume, if it is the first he has written, is full of promise.‡ He begins with an eloquent protest against fatalism in history; he does not admit that what are called "accomplished facts" are necessarily right, and he cannot see that the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was, even in the long run, productive of any good for freedom of conscience. Examining, in the next place, the influences which have contributed to shape modern France, he reduces them to two—first, that of the "Legists," and afterwards that of literary men; law on the one side and imagination on the other, the spirit of government and the spirit of political life. The former treated freedom as quite a secondary matter; all their efforts were directed towards the unity and concentration of the supreme power, the claims of justice, and the putting down of feudal pretensions. In describing the origin of the French *bourgeoisie* thus identified with the representatives of the law, M. Bardoux has selected two men now almost unknown, but who in their days played a conspicuous part as politicians—Jean de Doyad and Jean de Basmaison; they belonged respectively to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The reigns of Henry IV., Louis XIII., and Louis XIV. saw the rapid progress of the spirit of Gallicanism, which soon pervaded the whole French magistracy, and furnished absolute monarchy with its most formidable weapons. When, under Louis XV., the earliest signs of the dissolution of the old order of things manifested themselves, the Legists, still keeping steadily in view their favourite idea of an omnipotent power ruling over a nation of *bourgeois*, really paved the way for the dictatorship of the revolutionary leaders, and for the triumph of equality at the expense of liberty.

Cardinal du Perron held a conspicuous position in the history of the early seventeenth century.§ He was distinguished both as a prelate and as a politician; and although in this latter capacity he never obtained the reputation to which Cardinal de Bérulle finally rose, yet he took an active part in the States-General of 1614–1615, and in the Assemblies of the Notables at Rouen in 1596–1597 and 1617. But if we wish to discover the secret of the popularity so long enjoyed by Du Perron, we must study him as a poet, a controversialist, and a pamphlet-writer. Examined from this threefold point of view, he stands out as one of the leading men of his age; and M. l'abbé Feret has grouped around him in an agreeable manner well-known characters, such as Pontus de Thyard, Malherbe, Desportes, Bertaut, and others. The discussion which Du Perron carried

* *Dictionnaire universel des littératures*. Par G. Vapereau. Livraisons 1-4. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

† *Etudes sur le seizième siècle en France*. Par Ph. Charles. Paris: Charpentier.

‡ *Les légistes; leur influence sur la société française*. Par A. Bardoux. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

§ *Le cardinal du Perron, orateur, controversiste, écrivain: étude historique et critique*. Par l'abbé Feret. Paris: Didier.

* *Essai sur le ministère de Turgot*. Par T. Foncin. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

† *Histoire de la formation territoriale des états de l'Europe centrale*. Par Auguste Himly. Vols. I. and II. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

‡ *Géographie historique et administrative de la Gaule romaine*. Par Ernest Desjardins. Vol. I. Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co.

on with Du Plessis Mornay at Fontainebleau, and the results of which have been so variously stated, could not but produce a great deal of bitter feeling in the Huguenot camp. On the other hand, he saw himself exposed to the attacks of the Gallican party, and accused of leaning too much towards Ultramontanism. Hence it is that he has been criticized with almost equal virulence at Geneva and at the Sorbonne, and that, side by side with Agrippa d'Aubigné, Elie Benoit, and Bayle, we find on the list of his adversaries Guy Patin, the Abbé de Longuerue, and Levesque de Burigny. Our biographer takes the strictly Roman Catholic side, and sets up as a champion of Du Perron, whose merits he is perhaps somewhat inclined to overrate. On the whole, however, this new contribution to the literary and clerical history of France during the reign of Henry IV. is a very creditable and interesting work.

Schopenhauer's disquisition on free-will falls properly within the province of German literature*; but we feel bound for two reasons to notice the French translation published in M. Germer-Baillière's *Bibliothèque de philosophie contemporaine*. In the first place, it is an excellent rendering of one of the most difficult essays of the "modern Buddhist," as he is often called; in the next, it is accompanied by notes and elucidations which add considerably to the importance of the work. The anonymous translator, for instance, shows from the evidence of Schopenhauer himself that the very thinker whose chief boast it was that he had carried Kant's scepticism to its last consequences managed to combine atheism of the most decided character with an equally firm belief in magnetism, somnambulism, ghosts, and revelations obtained through the medium of dreams. In another note, written *à propos* of Schopenhauer's rabid attack upon Leibnitz and Hegel, the French critic remarks that philosophers often assail with special violence those whom they consider as having had the start of them in the development of their own favourite doctrines; and that Schopenhauer would probably not have felt so very angry with those two distinguished metaphysicians if he had not borrowed from the former his fundamental notions of dynamism, and from the latter his ideas of unconscious finality.

The amusing little volume recently published by M. Léouzon-Leduc† is very much like the *Souvenirs d'un diplomate* of M. d'Ideville. It is a series of anecdotes, sketches, and portraits, of which politics form the background, and which give us a great deal of useful information respecting the negotiations carried on among the various Courts of Europe and the personages who have taken a leading part in the events of the last thirty years. M. Guizot, M. Thiers, Marshal Vaillant, Lord Beaconsfield, and Prince Bismarck contribute largely to M. Léouzon-Leduc's gossiping chapters; and readers who remember M. Maxime Ducamp's *Souvenirs de 1848* will turn with particular interest to the chapter which treats of M. de Lamartine considered as a statesman. There is here a tone of irony which is highly amusing, and the dignified attitude of the poet-politician amidst the hesitation of some, the stupidity of others, and the rapacity of nearly all, is well described. Here and there the criticism of a new book leads M. Léouzon-Leduc to compare political characters of times gone by with those of the present day. Thus M. Choppin's edition of the Abbé de Gravière's work on Turenne's campaign in Alsace affords him an opportunity of noticing the esteem which the military men of the seventeenth century had for civilians when civilians were really persons of ability; and from this the transition is easy to a dig at General Trochu, who blundered so desperately because, with him, a pair of epaulettes was always the outward and visible sign of cleverness and military skill.

Some of the "creatures" portrayed by MM. de Goncourt are of a very queer description‡, and belong to a class of society which has no pretensions to be called aristocratic. Several of them are people of whom it would be difficult to say why they should ever have the honour of a biographical notice.

The magnificent folio volume now in course of publication for which we are indebted to M. Charles Yriarte§ is worthy of the subject it is intended to illustrate. The work begins with a short historical introduction; the author then describes somewhat more in detail the principal episodes in the annals of the "Queen of the Lagoons"; he relates the growth of its commerce, the importance of its relations with the other nations of Europe and with the Levant, and shows by what stages it sank, about the end of the sixteenth century, to the humble position of a third-rate city. Few subjects lend themselves so readily to pictorial embellishment as the history of Venice. The field is immense, and selection is the only difficulty. The letterpress and the illustrations of M. Yriarte's work are both excellent, and we have only to hope that it may be continued in the style of the part now before us.

Natural science in its various branches occupies a conspicuous place in the catalogue of works lately published by M. Rothschild. If we wish to become acquainted with the insects which destroy our trees, we cannot do better than study the handy little book composed by MM. de la Blanchère and Eugène Robert.¶ It begins with a description of the pests to be found more especially

in woods and forests; the second part treats of public walks, and of the gradual destruction of elms, chestnut-trees, lime-trees, &c. The authors explain in detail the best mode either of preventing the obnoxious insects from beginning their ravages or of destroying the creatures themselves.

M. Laurencin deals with telegraphy.* Beginning with the old signals in use amongst the Chinese, he describes the attempts made by Amontons and Chappe; he then examines the principle and applications of pneumatic telegraphy, and afterwards devotes fifteen chapters to electric telegraphs, treating the question from every point of view, comparing various systems, and finishing an excellent handbook with a list of tariffs and other useful particulars. The volume is very well illustrated.

The adulteration of articles of food is a topic on which practical information must always be welcome. Hence Professor Vogt's manual†, recently translated into French by MM. Focillon and Dauphin, and intended for the use, not only of consumers and merchants, but of all persons interested in sanitary matters, either officially or otherwise.

We are indebted to M. Depuiset for a splendid volume on European moths and butterflies.‡ The anatomy of the Lepidoptera, their metamorphoses, their habits and instincts, are treated of first; we have next a chapter on butterfly- and moth-hunting, followed by directions of a practical kind on the formation and preparation of collections; and a bibliographical list of special works on the subject concludes the first part. The second division of the volume is devoted to the classification and iconography of European Lepidoptera; the author has consulted the leading authorities on the subject, and given the nomenclature of Linnaeus and Latreille. Fifty large chromolithographs and nearly three hundred woodcuts reproduce the principal types of the various genera. The volume forms part of a series of illustrated monographs, the first of which, treating of the Coleoptera, was published last year.

French literature is rich in those short and unpretending dramatic compositions which the late Alfred de Musset made so popular. Carmontelle was the first to write "proverbs," as they are called; Théodore Leclercq rose to well-deserved celebrity by his comediettas; but the author of *Il faut qu'une porte soit ouverte ou fermée* soon surpassed them both, and easily obtained the first place in a style of writing which is far more difficult than people would at first imagine. When the action is reduced to its minimum, and there is little or no plot, it is easy for an author to become affected and to fall into what our neighbours call *marivaudage*. Even Alfred de Musset himself is not always guiltless on that score, and M. Octave Feuillet very frequently offends. If M. François de la Haulle's volume§ shows a tendency in the same direction, it may at any rate claim the distinction of being both elegantly written and unexceptionable in a moral point of view. The "proverbs" of which it consists are essentially drawing-room sketches, fit to be acted before the severest critics, and requiring no expurgation whatever.

Mme. Claire de Chandeneux has struck out for herself a new path in fiction. Scenes of military life have, indeed, already been described with much ability by several French novelists; but Alfred de Vigny's *Servitude militaire* is only one item in a long list of remarkable works, and M. Paul de Molènes never attempted to follow up the idea which he had so cleverly worked in his *Soirées du Bordé*. Mme. de Chandeneux, on the contrary, has selected the soldier's career as her special province. The wife of an officer holding a distinguished rank in the French army, she draws less on her imagination than on her reminiscences, and this is why the characters she brings before us are so living, so real, and at the same time so original. The *Lieutenant de Rancy*|| is the fifth episode in a series of novels all equally interesting.

The *Journal d'une désœuvrée*¶ introduced to us by M. de Parseval-Deschênes is a collection of tales supposed to contain the experience of a lady who, having no fixed occupation, sits down to write her journal and to keep a register of her thoughts and impressions. The famous saying about "some mischief still for idle hands to do" has found one exception, at any rate, in our anonymous *désœuvrée*; her concluding axiom is that all the happiness of a married woman comes from her husband—a trite piece of morality, perhaps, for our own virtuous country, but one which is less generally accepted on the other side of the Channel.

M. Charpentier's *Petite bibliothèque* has lately received two additions**—the third and last volume of Alfred de Musset's comedies, and the series of the same author's *Contes et nouvelles*; we are promised M. Mérimée's *Colomba*, some of M. Jules Sandeau's delightful tales, and a variety of other choice specimens of contemporary French literature, all printed in an elegant form and illustrated with engravings.

* *La télégraphie*. Par P. Laurencin. Paris: Rothschild.

† *Les aliments; détermination pratique de leurs falsifications*. Par E. Vogt. Paris: Rothschild.

‡ *Les papillons: organisation, classe, classification*. Par A. Depuiset. Paris: Rothschild.

§ *Proverbes de salon*. Par François de la Haulle. Paris: Lévy.

|| *Les ménages militaires. Le lieutenant de Rancy*. Par Claire de Chandeneux. Paris: Plon.

¶ *Journal d'une désœuvrée*. Paris: Didier.

** *Contes et nouvelles—Comédies et proverbes*. Par Alfred de Musset. Paris: Charpentier.

* *Essai sur le libre arbitre*. Par Arthur Schopenhauer; traduit en français pour la première fois. Paris: Germer-Baillière.

† *Les cours et les chancelleries: impressions et souvenirs*. Par E. Léouzon-Leduc. Paris: Dentu.

‡ *Quelques créatures de ce temps*. Par E. et J. de Goncourt. Paris: Charpentier.

§ *Venise, histoire, art, industrie; la ville, la vie*. Par Charles Yriarte. Paris: Rothschild.

¶ *Les ravageurs des forêts et des arbres d'alignement*. Par H. de la Blanchère et E. Robert. Paris: Rothschild.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 4d., or \$7 58 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, Mr. DAVID JONES, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 4 Trafalgar Square, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW Bill of Contents will be forwarded every Friday Evening by post, prepaid, to any Newsagent in Town or Country on application to the Publisher.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,110, FEBRUARY 3, 1877:

- The Coming Session.
Mr. Gladstone at Taunton. A Crisis on the Stock Exchange.
The American Presidency. The Block in the Law Courts. The Home Rule Party.
Lord Dufferin at Toronto. Legal Blundering.
Education in Egypt. The Doctrine of Race.
Gentleman Helps. Mr. Lowe on Universities. Atlantic Traffic.
Hospitalities to the Press. Training Schools for Army Recruits.
Richard III. at the Lyceum.
Wyatt's History of Prussia.
Survivals of Early English Words. Keble's Occasional Writings.
Cameron's Journey Across Africa. Burton's Etruscan Bologna.
Water-Colour Paintings in South Kensington Museum. By the Elbe.
Chaucer for Children. French Literature.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,109, JANUARY 27, 1877:

- Turkey and Europe—Sir Stafford Northcote at Liverpool—French Parties—Mr. Gladstone on the Prince Consort—The Famine in the Decan—Chill—The Junior Clergy and the Trade Unions—The Great Job.
Silence—Scottish Student Life—Independent Ladies—The Allyngh College—A Moorland Church—Theology of the Daily Press—The Phonetics Again—An American Hero.
Through Persia by Caravan—Life of Bishop Frampton, Non-Juror—Rugby Modern Geography—Homeric Transformations—The Parvenu Family—Life of Lord Selbourne—Canoe and Camp Life in British Guiana—Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.—American Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

THE SOCIETY OF PAINTERS in WATER COLOURS.—The FIFTEENTH WINTER EXHIBITION of SKETCHES and STUDIES is NOW OPEN, 5 Pall Mall East. Ten till Five. Admission 1s. ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.

DORÉ'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING the PRETORIUM," and "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM" (the latter just completed), each 30 by 22 feet; with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. &c., at the DOVE GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six. 1s.

MR. MARTIN COLNAGHI'S WINTER EXHIBITION PICTURES, by Domingo, Roybet, Tapiro, Israel, Rosa Bonheur, De Nittis, Bionelli, Escurra, Willems, Stevens, &c. &c. Open Daily. Admission, 1s., including Catalogue. GUARDI GALLERY, 11 Haymarket.

CLIFTON COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS.—NINE or more will be open to competition at Midsummer 1877, value from £25 to £50 a year, which may be increased from a special fund to £50 a year in cases of Scholars who require it. Further particulars may be obtained of the HEAD-MASTER or SECRETARY, the College, Clifton, Bristol.

ELIZABETH COLLEGE, GUERNSEY. Founded A.D. 1563. Six close Scholarships at Oxford, Valuable School Exhibitions and Prizes. Preparation for Woolwich, Cooper's Hill, Army, Navy, and Civil Service. Special attention paid to French and German. Climate excellent. Terms from 50 to 70 Guineas. For Prospectus, &c. apply to the PRINCIPAL.

EDUCATION (Private, High-class) in GERMANY, with the unusual advantages of the Royal Colleges, attended by the Sons of the Crown-Prince of Germany. Thorough French and German by resident Graduates, and a refined English home.—Address, Dr. SAURE, M.A., Cassel, who will be at the Langham Hotel at Easter.

HIGHCLERE, NEWBURY.—The Rev. E. T. WATERS, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford, prepares BOYS between Seven and Twelve years of age for the Public Schools. A resident French and German Governor. Vacancies after Easter. The highest references can be given.—Address, Highclere Rectory, Newbury, Berks.

WOOLWICH, ARMY DIRECT, COOPER'S HILL, and CIVIL SERVICE.—A CAMBRIDGE WRANGLER, who has passed 300, prepares TWELVE PUPILS only. High-Class assistance.—Rev. Dr. HUGHES, Ealing, W.

HOME EDUCATION for about TWELVE BOYS, by a married CLERGYMAN, experienced (twenty years) in Tuition, who is assisted by a resident Foreign Tutor. Constant supervision, Individual Teaching. Preparation for Public Schools. Terms 80 or 90 Guineas a year.—Address, Rev. G. FOOTE, Scarborough.

PRIVATE TUITION.—UNIVERSITIES and PROFESSIONS.—A M.A. Scholar and Prizeman, Vicar of a small and pleasant parish in Bucks, who has had great experience and success, desires a PUPIL, as companion to another.—Address, ZETA, Mr. Atcock, Broad Street, Oxford.

EDUCATION, SOUTH COAST.—THE DAUGHTERS of GENTLEMEN can be received in a First-class SCHOOL at the Seaside. Masters from London and Brighton attend. Twelve out of Seventeen Pupils have passed the Oxford Examinations in three years. Reference permitted to the Rev. Canon GREGORY.—Address, Miss HARRISON, Littlehampton.

MANSION for COLLEGIATE, SCHOLASTIC, Private, or other purposes, TO BE SOLD, THE LEASE, together with the Furniture and Fixtures, of an unusually large and noble MANSION, in a fashionable and convenient district near Town. The premises, with extensive grounds, are peculiarly adapted to the purposes of a college, first-class school, or large institution, for which object they are probably without a rival in England.—For full particulars, apply to S. B., care of Messrs. Street Brothers, 5 Serle Street, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.

TO CLUB GENTLEMEN and M.P.'s.—A noble ROOM, on the First Floor, in a Mansion, Westbourne Terrace, Hyde Park, furnished as Bed and Sitting Room. Terms, 5 Guineas per week. Man-servant kept.—Address, V., Library, 7 Bishop's Road, W.

TO GENTLEMEN desiring to Enter Business.—LESSONS in PRACTICAL BOOK-KEEPING, by DOUBLE ENTRY, given by a PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT at his Office.—For Terms, &c., address, AUDITOR, Messrs. Bruce & Ford's, 1 Trump Street, E.C.

HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill. Physician—Dr. EDWARD LAKE, M.A., M.D. Edin. For Invalids and those requiring rest and change. Turkish Baths on the premises. Private entrance to Richmond Park.

BEN RHYDDING HYDROPATHIC ESTABLISHMENT and SANATORIUM, WHARFEDALE. SPECIAL WINTER TERMS. For particulars address the MANAGER, Ben Rhydding, near Leeds.

HOTELS.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Superior Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel. P. O. RICKARDS, Manager.

THE GRANVILLE PRIVATE SPECIAL EXPRESS TRAINS to ST. LAWRENCE-ON-SEA, near RAMSGATE, in TWO HOURS. Departures every Friday, from Charing Cross, at 3.45, and Cannon Street, 3.50 P.M. (See Bill).

HYDROPATHIC. Turkish, Swimming, and every description of Medical Baths, the most complete in Europe. MARBLE SKATING RINK, BILLIARDS, AMERICAN BOWLS.

THE GRANVILLE is Superbly Fitted, and affords every Home comfort and convenience as a Winter Resort. Boarding Terms, 12s. 6d. per day. Address, THE MANAGER, St. Lawrence-on-Sea, near Ramsgate.

OLD ARTIFICIAL TEETH BOUGHT.—Persons having any to SELL can apply, or if sent by post their value will be sent per return.—Messrs. BROWNING, Manufacturing Dentists, 57 Ebury Street, near Victoria Station, London; and 57a Ship Street, Brighton. "the only purchasers of Old Teeth." Established 30 years.

E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, and 34 Royal Exchange, London, Manufacturers of CHRONOMETERS, WATCHES, CLOCKS, &c. (Catalogues free) to Her Majesty, H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and Foreign Sovereigns. Makers of the Great Westminster Clock, and of the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich.

WILLIAM S. BURTON, 39 Oxford Street, W.—The Perfect SUBSTITUTE for SILVER.—The real NICKEL SILVER, introduced more than Thirty Years ago by WILLIAM S. BURTON, when plated by the patent process of Messrs. Elkington & Co., is the best article next to silver that can be used as such, either usefully or ornamentally, as by no test can it be distinguished from real silver.

PATTERNS:	Fiddle or Old Silver.		Bead or Thread.		King's or Shell.	
	10s.	12s.	10s.	12s.	10s.	12s.
Table Forks or Spoons.....	per dozen	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Desert ditto ditto.....	"	1 2 .	1 5 .	1 11 .	1 2 .	1 2 .
Tea Spoons.....	"	14 .	1 .	1 .	1 2 .	1 2 .

These are as strongly plated and are in every respect at least equal to what other houses are selling as their first quality at very much higher prices. A second quality of Fiddle Patterns—Table Spoons and Forks, 2s. per dozen; Desert, 1/6 per dozen; Tea Spoons, 1/2s. per dozen. Tea and Coffee Sets, in white metal, from £3 15s. to £7 7s.; Dish Covers, beaded pattern, £11; Ditto ditto, fluted, £15; from £9 to £24 the set of four; Corner Dishes, from £7 10s. to £18 15s.; the Set of Four; Warmers, £7 2s. 6d. to £15 15s.; Biscuit Boxes, 1/1s. to £5 10s.; Crust and Liqueur Frames, &c., at proportionate Prices.

The largest Stock in existence of Plated Desert Knives and Forks, and Fish-eating Knives and Forks and Carvers. All kinds of Replating done by the Patent Process.

WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment, to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, post free, containing upwards of 850 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with List of Prices and Plans of the Thirty large Show-rooms, 39 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 1A, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard; Manufacturers, 84 Newman Street; and Newman Mews, London, W.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOORE'S HIRE SYSTEM. The original, best, and most liberal. Cash Prices; no Extra Charge for time given. Large, useful stock to select from. Illustrated priced Catalogue, with Terms, post free.—248, 249, and 250 Tottenham Court Road. Established 1862.

MORRIS & COMPANY'S

PAPER-HANGINGS,
PRINTED COTTON GOODS,
FURNITURE SILKS AND VELVETS,
TAPESTRIES,
FLOOR CLOTHS, AND CARPETS.

26 QUEEN SQUARE, BLOOMSBURY.

N.B.—No Paper-hangings or Printed Cottons are of MORRIS & COMPANY'S design unless their name appears on the margin of each piece.

CLARK'S PATENT STEEL NOISELESS SHUTTERS, Self-Colling, Fire and Thief Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Prospectus free.—CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manufacturers, Liverpool, and Dublin.